

JANUARY, 1951

SOCIAL ORDER

IN THIS ISSUE

- Social Order The Editors
- You and the Economic Council
Joseph B. Schuyler
- Co-Management in Germany
Quentin Lauer
- Social Thought of Brazilian Bishops
Roberto Saboia de Medeiros

SOCIAL ORDER

Vol. I (o.s. IV)

JANUARY, 1951

No. 1

CONTENTS

... just a few things		1
SOCIAL ORDER	The Editors	3
Profit Sharers Meet	Walter B. Dimond	7
Co-Management in Germany	Quentin Lauer	11
Social Attitudes of Brazilian Hierarchy		
	Roberto Saboia de Medeiros	23
You and the President's Economic Council	Joseph B. Schuyler	29
Man in the Community as Measure	Edward Duff	36
Trends		41
Books		43
Letters		47

LEO C. BROWN, S.J.

National Director, Institute of Social Order

FRANCIS J. CORLEY, S.J.

Editor, SOCIAL ORDER

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL ORDER

John L. Thomas, S.J., assistant director, Joseph M. Becker, S.J., Cornelius A. Eller, S.J., Albert S. Foley, S.J., Mortimer H. Gavin, S.J., Philip S. Land, S.J., William A. Nolan, S.J.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

RICHARD P. BURKE, S.J.
Weston College

DAVID E. MEIER, S.J.
West Baden College

RUSSELL M. BOEHNING, S.J.
Alma College

JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER, S.J.
Woodstock College

FRANCIS A. PETRU, S.J.
Saint Mary's College

RICHARD F. SMITH, S.J.
Saint Mary's College

Published monthly (except July and August) by the Institute of Social Order, 3115 South Grand Boulevard, St. Louis 18, Mo. Subscription price, \$4.00 a year; single copies, 40c. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

...just a few things

I AM DELIGHTED to welcome our new readers. This step which we are taking in offering the magazine to a larger audience than our Jesuit brethren has been long planned and hoped for. I am certain that the publication will profit from the critical reading of a larger and more disparate audience. And I feel reasonably confident that you will profit as well.

Inevitably, I suppose, the largest part of our new audience will be Catholic. Nevertheless, we earnestly hope that we shall have the opportunity to present our ideas to our non-Catholic brethren, as well.

•

THE FIRST ARTICLE in this issue briefly presents the objectives of SOCIAL ORDER. It must be emphasized (as the article does) that we are not proposing solutions to our social problems. We are a team seeking applications of our principles to the American scene. At the same time we are confident that our principles, rightly applied, will give us the solutions we seek.

•

THROUGH THE KIND collaboration of Rev. Walter B. Dimond, S.J., of Xavier University, Cincinnati, SOCIAL ORDER carries, in addition to announced articles, a report on the third annual conference of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, held in that city November 30 and December 1, 1950.

•

FATHER LAUER'S ARTICLE on co-management in Germany was written prior to the discussions which followed the address of Pius XII to the Catholic International Congress for Social Study on June 3, 1950. On that occasion the

Pope made it clear that neither the nature of the labor contract nor the nature of the business enterprise establishes a right on the part of employees to economic joint-management.

In some Catholic circles there had been a tendency, perhaps less marked in Germany than elsewhere, to regard the business establishment as a community and to assert that all members, like citizens of a municipality, by the very fact of membership, possess other rights in an enterprise than the right to a just compensation.

The recent statement of Pius XII, as well as Pius XI's defense of the wage contract, may require some Catholic writers to modify extreme positions and others to rephrase somewhat loose statements about worker participation in management. But the whole question of the wisdom of requiring worker co-management in Germany by law continues to be a matter of discussion. Would worker co-management bring about greater worker security? Would it lead to greater efficiency? Would it promote the common welfare? Should a distinction be made between those businesses which are managed by their owners and large corporations managed by trustees for multitudes of stockholders? Should the law, which confers limited liability on corporations, require that workers have some voice in designating the management, as a price for that privilege? What is to be the role of unions in such control?

•

FATHER SABOIA'S ANALYSIS of two joint pastoral statements of the Catholic hierarchy in Brazil is the first in a series of eight that will review the social attitudes of hierarchies in Holland, Spain, France, Canada, the Philippines,

Australia and the United States, as well as Brazil. Father Saboia is editor of *Serviço Social* (São Paulo).

THE ARTICLE ON the Council of Economic Advisers represents a lot of work (including interviews with Council staff-members and its former chairman, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse) to give you a good picture of its history and present status. The most significant point of the article is the unresolved conflict which Father Schuyler points up at the conclusion.

In the February issue we shall print an appraisal of the Council's 1951 *Annual Economic Review*, prepared by Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J., professor of economics at St. Louis University.

IN EACH ISSUE WE hope to have a review of some book which is a significant contribution to social thought or at least discusses some topic of vital importance. Father Edward Duff's review of Baker Brownell's *The Human Community* makes it sufficiently evident that the book itself is not impor-

tant. Nevertheless, there is scarcely a single social idea, except that of the dignity of the human person, that needs greater emphasis in our atomized American culture than the idea of *community*. We have lost communities and the sense of community, until today man stands isolated and alone.

The idea of community will be discussed frequently in future issues of SOCIAL ORDER.

THE FEBRUARY ISSUE of SOCIAL ORDER will contain the following articles:

Toward Economic Order

Peter de Bruin, S.J.

Why Economic Order?

Francis J. Corley, S.J.

Psychologists View Group Relations

John LaFarge, S.J.

The Annual Economic Review

Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J.

Social Attitudes of the

Spanish Hierarchy

Joaquin Azpiazu, S.J.

John F. Cronin, S.S., *Catholic Social Thought*

Reviewed by John L. Thomas, S.J.

F. J. C., S.J.

SOCIAL ORDER

The Editors

WE PRESENT the following information about the Institute of Social Order and the previous history of SOCIAL ORDER in the hope that it may be of value to you, our new readers, in trying to understand our objective.

The Institute of Social Order (I.S.O.) is a non-profit corporation, composed of Jesuit social scientists. It was set up in 1939 to study American social problems and to apply Christian social principles to their solution.

Members of the Institute at present are: Revs. Leo C. Brown, the national director; John L. Thomas, assistant director; Francis J. Corley, editor of SOCIAL ORDER; Joseph M. Becker, Cornelius A. Eller, Albert S. Foley, Mortimer H. Gavin, Philip S. Land, William A. Nolan.

The Staff

Perhaps a word about these men will be of interest to you:

LEO C. BROWN, S.J., PH.D. (Harvard University, 1940), national director of the Institute of Social Order.

After taking the doctorate at Harvard University, Father Brown was granted a Wertheim Fellowship by that University to expand the scope of his doctoral dissertation. As a result of his research he published *Union Policies in the Leather Industry*, (Harvard University Press, 1947). In 1948 he published *Impact of the New Labor Law*, (ISO, St. Louis, Mo., 1948). Occasional articles have appeared in *Review of Social Economy*, *SOCIAL ORDER*, and *Industrial Relations Research Association*. An ar-

ticle on the significance for the United States of recent papal pronouncements on co-management will appear in *SOCIAL ORDER* about March, 1951.

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J., PH.D. (Chicago University, 1949), assistant director of ISO, 1950.

Father Thomas wrote his doctoral thesis on *Some of the Factors Involved in the Breakdown of Catholic Marriage*. This involved analysis of 7,000 broken Catholic marriages in a large urban center. Since joining ISO, Father Thomas has taught courses in sociology at St. Louis University and has lectured on various topics of social interest. His research, at present, is concentrated on patterns of Catholic marriages across the country. Last June he participated in the annual Workshop on Marriage and the Family at the Catholic University. For the past three years he has read papers at the National Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Association, and he has published articles in *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Catholic Sociological Review*, *America*, *Hospital Progress*, and *Sign*.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J., PH.D. (St. Louis University, 1950).

Father Gavin's dissertation was *The Position of Labor in the Pulp and Paper-Making Industry*. During the past summer Father Gavin spent considerable time in field work in Wisconsin and northwestern states, amplifying his material for a book on labor relations in the pulp and paper industry.

At the present time he is teaching a graduate course in labor economics and is preparing monographs on "feather-bedding" and pension problems.

WILLIAM A. NOLAN, S.J., Ph.D. (Fordham University, 1949).

In preparation for his dissertation, Father Nolan made a serious study of Communist propaganda techniques, especially among Negroes. His dissertation, *Communism and the Negro*, reworked and amplified, has been accepted for publication and will appear next spring. He is continuing his studies of communism and is teaching a course on that subject in the Department of Sociology at St. Louis University. In addition, Father Nolan has written for *America* and *Interracial Review* and has lectured occasionally.

CORNELIUS A. ELLER, S.J., A.M. (Georgetown University, 1937).

Father Eller is currently completing a dissertation of *A Synthesis and Criticism on the Economic Doctrines of John A. Hobson*.

His interests lie in the field of economic theory and especially in its applications to unemployment, business cycles and economic planning. He is preparing a research project on monetary stabilization as a fundamental requirement of a sound economy. In addition to teaching economic theory in the Graduate School at St. Louis University, Father Eller has been a member of a national committee for the study of vocational order, and has contributed to *America*, *SOCIAL ORDER*, and *Thought*.

PHILIP S. LAND, S.J., Ph.D. (St. Louis University, 1950).

Father Land's dissertation, *Prolegomena to Economic Communities* was a preparatory study for future investigations into the problem of adapting vocational orders to the American scene. He is reworking this thesis for publication and has written several articles for

SOCIAL ORDER. Other articles are in preparation for *The Modern Schoolman* and *Revue de l'Action Populaire*. He conducts a seminar in the problems of economic organization in the Graduate School of St. Louis University.

JOSEPH M. BECKER, S.J., A.M. (Columbia University, 1946—).

Father Becker is working in the field of economics and within that field in the area of Social Security. His dissertation, on which he is currently engaged, investigates the operation of the Unemployment Insurance Program.

While engaged in his basic research, Father Becker held a University Fellowship at Columbia University and a Field Fellowship from the Social Science Research Council. His dissertation will soon be completed and will appear in book form later.

ALBERT S. FOLEY, S.J., Ph.D. (University of North Carolina, 1949).

At the University of North Carolina, Father Foley majored both in sociology and anthropology. Research for his dissertation dealt with some aspects of the relationship of Negroes to the Catholic Church. In recent years Father Foley has devoted considerable study and has written widely on racial problems. Among his articles which shortly will appear in *SOCIAL ORDER* is one entitled "Approaches to the Solution of Anti-Negro Prejudices."

FRANCIS J. CORLEY, S.J., M.A., S.T.L. (St. Louis University, 1941), editor of *SOCIAL ORDER*.

Father Corley is the author of a short exposition, *Family Allowances*, (Institute of Social Order, 1947) and co-author of a volume of hagiography, *Wings of Eagles*, (Bruce, 1940). He edited a symposium by leading housing authorities, *Rehousing Urban Slum Areas*, (Institute of Social Order, 1946). In addition to articles and reviews in *SOCIAL ORDER*, he has written

SOCIAL ORDER

for America, Catholic World, The Modern Schoolman and the American Catholic Sociological Review.

He took over the editorship of the *I.S.O. Bulletin* (which will be mentioned later in this article) in September, 1945. He continued as editor after the magazine was changed to SOCIAL ORDER.

Other Collaborators

In addition to these permanent I.S.O. staff members, all resident at St. Louis University, associate editors in five parts of the country cooperate in preparing articles and reviews. Material for the magazine is likewise supplied by other Jesuit social scientists throughout the United States and in other parts of the world. The Institute of Social Order works in close cooperation with similar groups in other countries, for instance, the Centro Studi Sociali (Milan), L'Action Populaire (Paris), Fomento Social (Madrid), Serviço Social (São Paulo, Brazil) and L'Ecole Sociale Populaire (Montreal).

Since 1943 I.S.O. has published a monthly periodical for members of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). In the beginning this publication was called the *I.S.O. Bulletin*; early in 1947 the name and format were changed to the magazine which you are reading today. Actually, this is volume IV of the old series, but we have begun a new series for the convenience of our new readers. Back issues, we regret, are not available, but you will have a complete file of the new.

Two-fold Objective

The purpose of the magazine was, like the purpose of I.S.O., to discuss social problems and work toward their solution. Some articles were intended to be introductory, to introduce younger members of the Society to the complexities of our problems and to Christian social principles. Others which were addressed to trained social scien-

tists, undertook to make some real progress toward social order.

It has always been evident to us that there were others outside the Society who would be interested in the discussions we were carrying on. Occasionally copies of the magazine came into the hands of non-Jesuits. They urged us to release it to the general public. That step has been taken, and we now offer you SOCIAL ORDER unchanged in format and objective.

We hope that you will be an interested reader, but we would like you to be more than that. We hope that you will be a collaborator and critic. There are no simple answers to social questions—at least we don't know them.

Effective remedies for any problem presuppose thorough knowledge of the problem. And we don't pretend to know all about any social problem, much less all about all social problems. Adequate understanding, and ultimate solution of any social problem demands the collaboration of many minds. SOCIAL ORDER is a medium through which, we hope, that collaboration can be obtained. Your ideas will be welcome in SOCIAL ORDER.

Problems To Be Discussed

In the course of the year we shall consider a large variety of problems. Much attention will be devoted to the complex question of industrial relations and economic democracy. There will be articles on the problems of minorities in the United States. Attention will be given to the family, the role of the state in social reform, agriculture and rural life. International problems and developments in other lands will be treated. On all of these questions we are eager to have your opinion.

On one score we must beg your indulgence. Not everything in any issue of SOCIAL ORDER will be of interest to you. Some articles will treat of subjects in which you are, perhaps, relatively uninterested. But we believe

that all of them are important, and they will be of greater interest to other readers.

Similarly, not all articles on topics that you are interested in will be of value to you. If you are a trained social scientist, you will probably consider some articles rather elementary. If, on the other hand, you are a layman, as far as the social sciences are concerned, some articles may appear too technical.

That problem is almost inevitable.

But you may be sure that our constant effort will always be to offer intelligent and informed comment on some social issue and, with equal effort, to make all our comment as clear and intelligible as possible.

With this brief note we hope to have made outlined to you the "why" and the "what" of SOCIAL ORDER. Your opinions and ideas will greatly aid us in achieving our future program. In this role, we sincerely and cordially welcome you.



Integral Humanism

The new *homo faber* who is developing himself today should develop concomitantly, and as soon as possible, a new *homo sapiens*.

The latter would not be preoccupied solely in reuniting to life and nature such goods as threaten to break away from them. He would reflect upon his laborious activity and realize that it could not be its own end.

He must see it as significant, like the work of the ploughman and the sower only in view of the harvest it is preparing, the harvest of eternity. And even during this existence in time, it must be at the service of a purer, more immanent activity, the activity of contemplation. He would understand, too, that, if each day he takes possession of a little more of the universe, it is in order that he may have more to offer; that he must not rest in the act which perfects him but must transcend even himself....

He can truly fulfill himself only by contemplating, offering and adoring.

HENRI DE LUBAC

The three-year-old Council of Profit Sharing Industries is making a genuine contribution to economic democracy in the United States.

PROFIT SHARERS MEET

Council Continues to Grow

Walter B. Dimond, S.J.

Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio

AN AVERAGE OF about 300 people attended the meetings at the third annual conference of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries held in Cincinnati on November 30 and December 1, according to Joseph B. Meier, of Akron, executive secretary. This probably means that over 400 people attended some of the sessions. The Council has 270 members in 34 states, Canada and Denmark. These company-members employ approximately 300,000 workers.

Five members of the Catholic clergy attended meetings. Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, archbishop of Cincinnati, at the dinner on November 30 praised the Council for its promotion of social justice. Rt. Msgr. Clarence G. Isenmann, vicar general of the archdiocese, gave the invocation at the first meeting. He is a nephew of the late H. C. Nicholas, of Orrville, Ohio, founder of the Council.

Besides the Catholic representatives, other clergymen present were a Jewish rabbi and two Protestant ministers.

Fr. Dempsey Reports

Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, S.J., professor of economics at St. Louis University, read a report of profit sharing in the St. Louis area. His report was based on a study of profit-sharing plans in that area made by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of St.

Louis University. Father Dempsey, an advisory trustee of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, was photographed in the *Cincinnati Post* with William Loeb, publisher of the *New Hampshire Morning Union*, Manchester, N. H., and chairman of the Council.

In addition to his report on the state of profit sharing in the St. Louis metropolitan area, Father Dempsey made ten general points about the advantages of profit sharing. These points are as follows:

1. It is a good practical combination of sound economics and Christian principles.
2. It gives a man dignity in his job and a better income.
3. It won't work unless everybody (management and labor) is in on it.
4. It always has provisions for listening to the ideas of employees.
5. It eliminates waste and improves the product.
6. It presupposes a fair, base wage and must not be used as a substitute for a fair wage.
7. It gets cooperation at plant level where the goods are produced.
8. It would solve most of our economic, labor-management problems if adopted universally in the right form.
9. It must be fitted to each individual industry.

10. The employees must adopt it. It must not be foisted upon them.

Interest Grows

Most of those who attended the meetings represented substantial companies and were chief executives. A large number of those in attendance represented firms already employing profit-sharing systems. In addition to these, a number of other observers represented firms that are contemplating the introduction of a profit-sharing system. Delegates to the conference were in attendance from such distant points as Alabama, Connecticut, New Hampshire, California and Canada.

The general theme was "Profit Sharing—an Arm of Freedom."

The morning session of the first day was devoted to introductory discussion of profit sharing.

Mr. James F. Lincoln, president of the Lincoln Electric Company, Cleveland, Ohio, explained the fundamentals of profit sharing and outlined the general principles under which systems were introduced. He reported that employees of his Company received an average income of more than \$6,000 last year through profit sharing. Lincoln said that bonuses above salaries ranged from \$3,500 to \$35,000. More than 70 per cent of the firm's workers own stock, and between 80 and 90 per cent of heads of families own their own homes, he said.

Mr. Cass S. Hough, executive vice-president of the Daisy Manufacturing Co., Plymouth, Michigan, outlined the various systems that experience had showed were of most value both to employers and to employees. He insisted that a profit-sharing plan "must be an honest, sincere approach to team work. It must not be mere lip service. It must not be just a means of getting more work out of employees. Nothing can be substituted for a fair basic wage."

Various Plans Outlined

More detailed discussion of various types of profit sharing plans were presented to the delegates in the afternoon session of the first day. Later in the afternoon delegates broke up into three simultaneous meetings divided according to the size of their business into small, medium and large to discuss the problems peculiar to each of these groups.

Workers for various profit-sharing industries spoke of profit sharing from the employees' point-of-view at the Friday morning meetings. James Burnham, of the Newspaper Guild, and Walter Cennerazzo represented companies where profit sharing is in the union contract. Mr. Cennerazzo very effectively extended the concept of cooperation inherent in profit sharing to the community as a whole, stating that a laborer does not wish to be regarded as a class apart from the American community in which he lives. The principal address at the luncheon on Friday was delivered by the Honorable Robert A. Taft, United States Senator from Ohio.

In his address before the convention of the Council, Senator Robert A. Taft emphasized the value of profit sharing as a means of making workers aware that they are an integral part of the business by which they are employed and that they have a personal interest in its continued prosperity. "Profit sharing," he said, "is advantageous because it helps teach workingmen not to think of themselves as a class apart."

He emphasized the special advantages of a profit sharing system for larger industries which are handicapped because they are peculiarly "subject to the bureaucratic difficulties of the federal government itself and do not always grant advancement and compensation in accordance with ability." Through profit sharing the firm is able to reward

competence and special ability even though advancement is not always secured.

Has Long Record

Mr. R. R. Deupree, chairman of the board of the Proctor and Gamble Company, summed up the spirit of the convention in his introduction of Senator Taft when he stated that Proctor and Gamble was still "a great believer in profit sharing after 63 years of it."

He added his personal convictions that soundly constructed profit-sharing plans would add greatly to the stability of employment and that this by-product of profit sharing might turn out to be of more value to the worker than the actual sharing of the profits.

"Today we are faced by not one war, but two," William Loeb, the chairman, declared at the opening meeting.

"We are faced, from outside the United States, by the most aggressive most ruthless, and most evil tyranny that this world has ever seen," he said. "Inside the United States those who believe in freedom are menaced by yet another combat. That is the war against those who would strangle our hopes for self-government and our hopes for increased national prosperity in the strait-jacket of socialism. This inner struggle weakens us in our external combat."

Antidote to Socialism

Loeb stated that people frequently are depressed as they see nations falling before the combined threat of Russian armed might and the false lure of Soviet promises of "a more prosperous world." They are equally discouraged, he added, when they see American citizens vote themselves into socialism, "lured on by the pie-in-the-sky doctrines of socialism."

"Those who believe in profit sharing," he explained, "are not so discouraged, because they have found a way which, unlike the dead hand of Socialism, promises an ever-expanding life for

the United States or for any other country which will adopt it. While Communism and Socialism would reduce the people to impotent cogs in a ruthless machine, profit sharing is dedicated to the principle that the most important factor in our industry is the individual worker. The Council believes that every workman should be a capitalist."

Fosters Good Relations

Several other speakers on Thursday told the conference that profit sharing is more than just "divvying up" industry's proceeds. They pictured the movement as a means by which workman and employer can share both the responsibility and financial rewards of a successful business.

D. J. Swartwout, Jr., president of the Swartwout Co., Cleveland, urged management to get into the habit of writing understandable letters to its employees. "Now the closest part of the American enterprise system and therefore the most easily understood is the enterprise in which each of us is actually working. So let's tell our employees all about our own businesses. Not just mere fragments of information. Not just what we feel we can trust them with. But really the whole story."

Horace Hull is president of the Hull-Dobbs Co., Memphis, which sold 50,000 cars in the last year and which bills itself as "The Largest Ford Dealer in the World." At a meeting of the trustees on Wednesday, Mr. Hull spoke about one part of his business and the effect of profit sharing upon it.

Expanded Business

"In 1938," he said, "our parts department was doing a business of \$18,000 a month. The department manager was paid \$250 a month and his assistant \$140 to \$170. We went into the department and told the manager

that the first thing we were going to do was raise his salary to \$350 a month and also raise that of his assistant. Then we said we were going to pay him one and one-half per cent and his assistant one per cent on all sales over \$18,000 a month. Sales started to climb, up to \$100,000 a month, and with the help of war orders, up to \$500,000 a month in five years. It has settled back now to about \$100,000 a month. The manager makes more money; we make more money, and he's happy and we are happy."

The Council of Profit Sharing Industries was established in 1947. At that time it was composed of 16 company members. At the annual meeting in December, 1949, the executive secretary reported that there were 155 industries members of the Council. During the past year membership has

almost doubled; 115 firms were added to the Council to bring the total to its present number of 270. The number of employees benefiting from profit sharing in these companies have grown from approximately 240,000 in 1949 to 300,000 at the present time.

The founder of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Mr. H. C. Nicholas, of Orrville, Ohio, died on Sunday, April 23, 1950. He was the president of the Quality Castings Company of that city. Quality Castings was a model of what modern industry can be from the point of view of efficient production, excellent human relations and fair distribution of income. His greater work in contributing to the establishing of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries has helped to extend these same conditions far beyond the walls of his own plant.

The Growth of Statism

It may seem farfetched to assert that individualism and collectivism are correlative. Yet both are characterized by a mass society.

Under individualism, the state is the only important social group which can give unity to millions of citizens. When individualism fails to attain social ends in the economic sphere, it is only natural that men would turn to the state, thereby enhancing its power at the expense of personal freedom.

If this process is carried to its logical conclusion we reach collectivism. Too often in the modern world such a result has been attained.

REV. JOHN F. CRONIN, S.S.

Background and current controversies connected with the demand of workers for a law to authorize a share in management in the new Germany.

CO-MANAGEMENT IN GERMANY

Toward Industrial Democracy

Quentin Lauer, S. J.

Sorbonne, Paris

THERE HAS BEEN a good deal of discussion in the United States about workers' participation in the management of business. Some union leaders and social philosophers of several groups have advocated measures that would give workers varying degrees of authority in the running of individual enterprises, as well as of whole industries.

A controversy that is raging in Germany at the present time will throw a good deal of light upon the entire question. This controversy differs from American discussions in that it is not concerned with practical problems of co-management*. It involves the existence or non-existence of an inherent right* (somewhat akin to the political right of citizens to vote) on the part of workers to share in the decisions of businessmen for whom they work.

Start of Current Dispute

In September, 1949, the 73rd Catholic Social Conference held in Bochum, Westphalia, expressed its collective mind in the following resolution:

Whether we regard the general economic system or the particular economic policies of a single plant, the human person must

be the central point in all considerations. Up to the present, legislation in the economic field has been too much interested in things and not enough in men. Legislation must be introduced which will bring man, his rights and his duties to the fore.

Catholic workers and employers are agreed that the right of co-determination for all workers in social, personal and economic questions is a natural right in the order intended by God, to which right corresponds the obligation of co-responsibility for all. We demand that this right be established by law. Following the lead of the most progressive business organizations, all businesses must now put this right into practice.

Not only is the common interest of a whole plant furthered by granting the right of co-determination to all in the plant, but it is according to the nature of human society that all men who are united in accomplishing a common aim should at the same time administer their common interests with individual responsibility in an order based on a common striving after a common goal.

Whether or not the authors of this resolution intended to throw a bombshell, whether they even knew they were throwing a bombshell into social and economic discussions in Germany, cannot be determined. The fact is that this statement has been interpreted as throwing the weight of at least semi-official sanction in the Church to one side of a question which has been hotly discussed in Germany for years.

*The remarks about this article in . . . just a few things: (page one of this issue) are pertinent to this question.

Although some Catholics were quick to point out that the resolutions of such a conference do not represent the official voice of the Church in Germany, the statement has been quoted and requoted throughout the length and breadth of Western Germany, Austria and Switzerland, and it is foreseeable that it will have a considerable effect on the new Bonn Bundesparlament as it sits down to frame economic and social laws for Germany. Certain it is that the statement has proved the occasion for renewed vigor on the part of socialists and labor unions in demanding legislation which they have long advocated.

In this discussion I shall present 1. a very brief survey of the history of co-determination in Germany from 1848 to 1945; 2. a brief examination of the 1949 Bochum resolution on the question and of later comments on it; 3. a synopsis of the position taken by Fr. Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J. one of the foremost proponents of co-determination; 4. an examination of some of the controversial issues, e. g., the mode of introduction of co-determination (whether immediate or gradual), the areas of joint decision (social, personnel and economic decisions), the role of the trade union in co-determination; 5. a summary of the principal arguments used by both proponents and opponents of co-determination; 6. a summary conclusion.

1. History of the Question

But, before attempting to understand the statement itself and the discussions centered around it, it might be well to trace briefly the steps by which the right of economic co-determination did become the question of the day. The idea, obviously, did not spring full-grown from the the mind of Jove.

As long as liberalism reigned in Germany there was not much point in even

talking about the rights of workers. To talk as though he even had rights was to brand oneself a socialist. Still, as early as 1848 there are traces of feeble attempts to let the voice of the worker be heard in industry. At that time in the constitutional convention of Hesse, held in Frankfurt, a suggestion was made that some sort of middle-man between employer and employee be appointed in each plant. The suggestion did not become law, and legislative concern for the worker seems to have slept for another 20 years. In 1869 another attempt was made, again to be met with defeat. It was not until 1891 that the first protective law was passed. This was expanded in 1905 and again in 1909 to include some sort of representation for the workers. The aim here was, to a large extent, the improvement of factory conditions, providing accident insurance and other social improvements. In all this, Hesse took the lead, but other sections soon followed with similar laws.

Now, all this may seem like pretty slow progress, but we must remember that the worker in America was also having his troubles getting recognition during these years. We must also remember the difference in conditions. Germany never had, properly speaking, an industrial revolution. Industrialism came to Germany and took a strong hold, but with a minimum of social change. The common man had been pushed around for a long time anyhow, and the fact that he was now being pushed around by industrialists did not make too much difference. Besides, we must realize that the German worker actually had it easier than his brother worker across the ocean. It was around 1890 that a German returning from the States could say, "Any German who works as hard here as one *must* work in America to keep from being trodden under foot has no need to emigrate."

Works Councils Established

With the coming (and going) of World War I the need of definite representation for the workers, guaranteed by law, became apparent. Such legislation was advocated by (among others) the socialists and the (Catholic) Center Party. In 1919, article 165 of the Weimar constitution set the stage for particular legislation by guaranteeing laborers and employees "equal rights in common with management in regulating conditions of wages and work, as well as the right to cooperate in the common economic development of productive forces." In accord with German legislative practice this was sufficiently vague to mean almost anything or to mean nothing. It was to be determined by particular law. This law was forthcoming on February 4th of the following year and was to be known as the Works Council Law.

Even today this law of 1920 serves as a basis for proposed new legislation on the subject. It set up definite works councils in all plants and determined their functions. It was not bad as a beginning, but it spread the representation too widely, thus cutting down its effectiveness. Perhaps its biggest flaw was in stressing the distinction between laborers and employees (labor and white-collar workers)—a distinction which still plagues recent attempts at legislation. Management, political groups and labor unions, each for its own reasons, have made much of this distinction and have helped to widen the breach.

The sad and brief history of the Weimar Republic came to an end with Hitler's seizure of power in 1933. Shortly thereafter followed the dissolution of all works councils. There was no room for them in an economy in which all decisions were made at headquarters.

But the idea did not die; it was one

of the first concerns of Germans immediately after the war. On August 18, 1945, the military government gave permission for the election of works councils, and on April 10, 1946, the occupation authorities of the three Western zones issued the now famous Law No. 22 confirming permission for the election of works councils and determining in a general way the conditions for election. This was what one might call a fundamental law, deliberately unclear, and intended to be made specific by the individual laws of the various *Laender* (States) and ultimately by the constitution of the republic.

Modern Legislation

Once more the lead was taken by Hesse, and in Article 37 of its constitution, which was passed on Dec. 1, 1946, we read: "Employees, laborers and officials in all plants and in government agencies have, in cooperation with trades unions, common representation in the affairs of the plant. Representatives are to be chosen in general, equal, free, secret and direct elections by the personnel."

"It is the function of these representatives, in cooperation with trades unions, to exercise co-determination with management in social, personnel and economic questions relating to the plant."

This article of the constitution was made much more specific in the Works Council Law of May 26, 1948. Hesse was followed in this by the *Laender*, Wuerttemberg-Baden and Bavaria, and by the free city, Bremen, all of whom provided in their constitutions and in their particular laws for similar works councils with similar rights.

These laws provided in one form or another for the right of co-determination in social, personnel and economic questions. In so doing they claimed to be merely specifying the provisions of their own constitutions and of Law No.

22, which in its 5th article stated that the functions of the works councils were to be determined and extended by the laws of the individual *Laender*. Nevertheless, the American military government (all four are in the American occupational zone) under General Clay decided that the co-determination clause exceeded the provisions of Law No. 22. The works councils were allowed to stand, but the co-determination clauses were suspended until such time as the constitution of the new German republic should make it clear whether such provisions were constitutional. The provisions have not been abrogated, merely suspended. Until a short time ago the situation was unchanged, but now in Hesse and Wuerttemberg-Baden the American authorities have permitted the application even of the co-determination clause, perhaps to see how it works. The legislative bodies of these *Laender* (and presumably of others) are waiting for the green light from the Federal parliament at Bonn before anything really definite can be passed in this matter.

2. Influence of Bochum Resolution

It is against this background that discussion on the right of co-determination in Germany is going on. Both sides feel that a great deal depends on the outcome of the discussions and, above all, on the decision of the Bonn government for or against legislation guaranteeing this right to labor. It is against this background, too, that the Catholic Social Conference in Bochum issued its epoch-making resolution.

The resolution has a somewhat unfortunate history which tends to discredit it, to a certain extent. Because socialists and the extreme elements in the labor unions are loud in advocating this right in a seemingly unlimited form, it behooved the voice of Catholic opinion to be extremely careful in the

wording of its proposal. A re-reading of the proposal will show that this care was not exercised. It has the air of going all overboard for something which is not quite clear in the minds of those who proposed it, something which, in the wrong hands and wrongly interpreted, could take it far beyond the Catholic social principles upon which it is supposed to be based.

To counteract an extreme interpretation of the resolution, Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne, issued a statement intended to clarify and explain the vague and rather over-enthusiastic language in which the resolution was couched.

When in the resolution the right of co-determination is called a "natural right in an order willed by God," an extraordinary natural suitableness is intended, which one can no longer in the present state of development oppose. When one speaks of the right of co-determination in social, personnel and economic questions, the meaning is not that this right has the same extension in the three fields or that in each field it is unlimited. Economic good sense forbids that.

In the actual running of the business, the plant management must be independent, if the plant itself is to be capable of operating and is to be thereby profitable even for the workers. Economic determination, for example, in a corporation could be so given that individual workers would be included in the board of directors, whereas in other types of plants it might be secured by a more thorough diffusion of profit possibilities. Above all, employees must be given a right to speak, when some plant is to be shut down and the livelihood of hundreds or thousands of employees is at stake.

The legislative introduction of the right of co-determination cannot be the thing of a day; it must be the conclusion of a gradual development, in which are tested the forms and practical workings of co-determination in the three different fields—in the different types of business, such as large, medium and small businesses, in those which are managed by the owner himself or those which are anonymously managed [By this expression is meant our American corporation. Ed.]—in good

SOCIAL ORDER

times and in bad times. The type of social experiment in England warns us to be cautious. The direction is clearly indicated; voices in favor of co-determination are ready in large numbers, but the road is still long.

Further Clarification

This statement has all the earmarks of a warning to Catholics not to line themselves up with the extremist elements, who want to introduce co-determination overnight without properly preparing the ground. Unfortunately, however, this statement served to cloud the issue in the minds of Catholics even more, since it was immediately pounced upon by the opposition as a repudiation of what had previously been said, as a repudiation of the very right of co-determination. To counteract this interpretation the chancery of the Archdiocese of Cologne issued a statement, which was intended to clarify both previous statements and to give the nearest thing to an official Catholic position on the question.

The representatives of the Catholic Church still stand, as they previously did, wholeheartedly behind the resolutions of the Bochum Catholic Social Conference with regard to the workers' right of co-determination. Nor do the explanations of Cardinal Frings signify any retreat from that position; rather they recognize even more the fundamental justification for the right of co-determination. The Cardinal merely wanted to express that this right can be put into practice only step by step. The Church stresses once more the necessity in the social field, in accord with the Bochum resolutions and the address of the Cardinal on the occasion of the election, that on the political side what can be attained must be pushed through as soon as possible.

Whether that statement represents an accurate explanation of the Cardinal's meaning may still be open to doubt. At any rate, informed Catholic opinion at the present time is about equally divided for and against the right of co-determination. Before we can understand the arguments for and against, however, we shall have to examine a

little more closely into the exact state of the question.

3. Necessary Distinctions

Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J., perhaps the foremost Catholic sociologist in Germany today, has been in on these discussions from the ground floor, so to speak. Quite recently he composed a little catechism on co-determination, which was published in pamphlet form by the Archdiocesan Social Apostolate in Cologne. It is one of the few pieces of writing in the German language which gives a clear and reasonably objective presentation of the point at issue. It is important, of course, to note that the author has for years advocated a political, social and economic organization of society according to vocational groups, in which some sort of co-determining voice for all would be a necessary presupposition. It is against this background that his conclusions on the present question must be judged.

Fr. von Nell-Breuning begins his pamphlet with a few fundamental distinctions: 1. between *de facto* and *de jure* co-determination; 2. between the right to an equal voice in original decisions and a sort of veto right (*zu minderem Recht*). He then proceeds to point out one indispensable condition and one necessary consequence of this right. The prerequisite condition is a sufficient knowledge of the field in which decisions are to be made. The necessary consequence is the assuming of responsibility (moral, legal and economic) for the results of the decision. And, he points out sagely, the very willingness to accept this responsibility is actually a prerequisite condition.

Next, the precise meaning of co-determination is further narrowed down to mean that certain decisions, which were formerly the sole prerogative of capital, would, according to this, be

shared by labor. This right, of course, already exists above the plant level in the democratic processes whereby a government shapes its general social and economic policies. And, to a certain extent, there are forms of co-determination to be found on the plant level. The aim of the workers, however, is to have co-determination on the plant level recognized as a right and to have it guaranteed by law.

Basis of Demands

As to the motives behind this demand, one meets with a difference of opinion. Among theorists there are those who demand the right on the grounds of security for the worker, who is now too much at the mercy of capitalistic caprice. There are others who demand it in order that the worker may be treated more as a responsible agent and less as a mere tool. It is difficult to determine which motive is uppermost in the minds of the workers themselves, but if the discussion is to be conducted on the basis of principle, it would seem that the dignity of the worker as a person must loom large.

Fr. von Nell-Breuning, who is writing for workers, stresses the reason of security, without neglecting the other. He lines up a series of complaints of the workers, which they feel can be remedied by the right of co-determination: 1. It is unreasonable that capital and labor should be expected to work together as a cooperative team, while capital continues to reserve to itself all the decisions; 2. capital misuses its power, striving only for its own ends, with the result that the plant does not accomplish all that it is capable of accomplishing; 3. this selfishness leads to over-production and under-consumption, resulting in crises, in which the worker is heaviest hit; 4. finally, this policy leads to war, in which labor suffers most—a particularly poignant complaint in present-day Germany.

4. Controversial Issues

All of which, of course, leads to the question, "Will the right of co-determination put an end to all that?" The answer is that it will not do it alone (it is no substitute for a more equitable distribution of property), but that it will curb rash speculation—acknowledging at the same time that it may serve to hinder sound enterprise. At any rate, they say, these complaints indicate the need of a large overall plan which can be secured, they insist, only by legislation.

A Natural Development

With the exception of radicals, to whom gradual development is the equivalent of stagnation, and a few opportunists, who want this legislation as a political plumb no matter what the cost, social theorists who advocate the right of co-determination admit that it must be realized in gradual stages. We have already seen that opinion expressed somewhat generically by Cardinal Frings.

In the first of these stages the workers would be granted a consultative voice, meaning that they would have the right that their suggestions be seriously considered. This would mean at the same time that—in order that their suggestions be worthy of serious consideration—they be informed with regard to proposed decisions. The second stage would be that of active co-operation, a sort of proving ground, where they would actually contribute toward putting into practice such measures as look to the good of the worker. The third stage, then, would be a real deliberative voice, actually cooperating in making decisions in those fields to which their right of co-determination extends. This is a far cry from the attitude which would give the worker a full deliberative voice immediately, and—let the devil take the hindmost.

SOCIAL ORDER

Areas of Discussion

And it is precisely here that we begin to get to the heart of the question as it is proposed today and as it is mostly hotly debated on both sides. The right of co-determination can be limited to strictly social questions; it can be extended to take in questions of personnel, or it can be complete and mean a share in strictly economic decisions. It goes without saying that when such a right becomes law, the law can determine to what questions in each of these fields the right does or does not extend.

For the most part the right to a deliberative voice in social questions, such as establishing measures for accident prevention, care of health, social care, child welfare and the like, is recognized and has been fairly widely realized. Personnel questions, which affect the individual worker as such, such as hiring and firing, transfers, raises and wage cuts, are also fairly generally recognized as coming within the legitimate field of effective co-determination—though certain abuses here and a certain vagueness as to where to draw the line make many employers fearful of it.

Still, the very heart of the problem as it stands today, the precise right for which labor is fighting and against which capital is maintaining a steady opposition is the right of co-determination on the economic level. Decisions on this level concern the very purpose for which a plant exists. They embrace such questions as the what, how, when and how much of production; increase or decrease in plant capacity; changes in policy, legal form, or plant location and the like. Moreover, it is right here at the heart of the problem that the greatest amount of vagueness can and does crop up on both sides.

One question which has to be settled in this connection is whether a real share in economic decisions can be demanded by labor in a situation where

the wage-contract is in force. Here even Fr. von Nell-Breuning allows himself to become a little vague and unconvincing. He quotes *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno* to the effect that capital cannot get along without labor nor labor without capital—concluding hastily that therefore this right can be demanded even under the wage-contract; to which he adds a caution in the words of Pius XII, "The owner of the means of production must remain master of his own economic decisions." (Address to International Union of Catholic Employers' Associations, May 5, 1949).

Possible Solutions

Since this seems to leave things slightly loose around the edges it suggests the question, "Should the wage contract be fundamentally changed and replaced by the partnership contract?" Again there are the words of Pius XII in the same address, to the effect that the entrepreneur has a perfect right to establish his business either on the basis of the wage contract or of the partnership contract.

The only solution, then, is to go back to those words, "Master of his own economic decisions," and see what they mean. They obviously mean that he cannot be forced against his own will to risk his own property in projects which someone else decides for him; he cannot be obliged, as it were, to pay the price because someone else buys what he doesn't want. But neither, contend the proponents of the right of co-determination, does it mean that he has a completely free hand with his business just because he does own the means of production. For one thing, the Pope speaks only of economic affairs, not of social and personnel problems. For another, he limits the right of control by the owner alone "within the bounds of public economic law."

This means that, in matters which

immediately affect the common good, the state has some measure of control, and in the minds of some Catholic social theorists, such as Fr. von Nell-Breuning, it means that an employer is not complete master in measures which immediately affect the good of the personnel. And it is to safeguard the welfare of the workers in such matters that they want legislation. This group, of course, recognizes that the right of co-determination, even under law, is to be limited to such matters as immediately affect the worker and does not extend to all decisions involved in the day-to-day carrying on of the business.

Practical Problems

At this point we can see how much the whole discussion needs clarification. We can see, too, that this clarification will come only through sober, cooperative working out of the exact implications in the demands of both sides. The present author has not been able to detect the necessary clarifications in any of the discussions which have taken place in Germany up to the present time. For one thing, the distinction between theory and practice seems to be constantly left in the background of the discussion instead of being brought to the fore where it belongs.

Everyone admits that the right of co-determination specifically in economic questions is the bone of contention, but no one wants to go out on a limb and define precisely what that means; no one wants to commit himself to a "so-far-and-no-farther" proposition. One side seems to be afraid that in so doing it will be asking less than it can get, and the other side that it will be granting more than it need. If a law were passed in terms as vague as those used in discussion (and that seems to be a danger) nothing would be solved. It is, of course, the sort of thing that might be solved by col-

lective bargaining, but the Germans are not particularly fond of that; they'd rather have a law passed and then go right on working.

Role of the Union

Another complication with very practical repercussions is the place to be assigned to the so-called works councils in all this. The laws of 1920, the tripartite control law, No. 22, and the laws of Hesse, Wuerttemberg-Baden, Bremen, and Bavaria were all known as works council laws. They provided for the very concrete institution of works councils in the various plants. The right of co-determination enters into these only as a function of these bodies. And that is precisely the point: must this right of co-determination be exercised through the works councils acting in the name of the workers?

The socialists and the labor union (the singular is used advisedly) say, yes. Theorists, and particularly Catholic theorists, say they are not so sure. If the influence of elements outside the plant on the activity of the works council cannot be eliminated, they say, then this body is not the proper instrument for exercising a right which belongs only to those actually occupied in the plant. Even if this influence is eliminated, however, they hint that there may be other means of implementing the right of co-determination, though they fail to be particularly specific as to what these other means may be. On the other hand, the direct opposition (those who oppose co-determination altogether) simply take it for granted that the right is to be implemented through the works councils and then point to various instances in which the works councils made fools of themselves in order to show how impracticable the whole thing is. They also point out that the union—which is supposed to be independent of any party, but which is in fact socialistic in its leanings—has pretty much of

SOCIAL ORDER

in abandoning, in whole or in part, machine-production methods. A means must be found to give the worker a sense of responsibility and individual achievement within the present framework. The means is the right of co-determination—particularly on the economic level.

2. The interest of labor in the what, how, when and how much of production is not indirect, nor does the burden of mistaken decisions in these matters at present fall on capital alone. Whether he has responsibility or not, the worker must take the consequences when the decisions are unwise. In a certain sense he has a more direct interest, since he has nothing to fall back on if a faulty decision costs him his job. The very fact that the decision can be carried out only by the cooperation of labor demands that he have a share in those decisions which can directly affect his welfare, whether they be social, personnel or economic.

Some Workers Capable

3. Even capital admits that in many instances labor has sufficient knowledge of the business and of the questions to be decided to warrant his having a share in the deliberations. That he is capable of assuming the moral, legal and economic responsibility for the results of his decisions is verified more and more each day. The fact that his and his family's security depend on avoiding wildcat decisions is an added reason for assuming this. In any event, the right of co-determination is to be realized only when and insofar as the worker can assume this responsibility. Whether the worker is actually willing to shoulder this responsibility is a question which no theorist can answer, but neither can anyone prove that he is not by merely asserting that he is not.

4. The limited liabilities of corporations, which are guaranteed by law, assure to capital a privilege which is not

balanced by any corresponding privilege for the workers, who must thus assume a disproportionate risk. It is suggested that a price to be paid for this limited liability might be a deliberative voice for labor. The works council law of 1920 provided that the works councils should elect two members to the board of directors. Something like that might be a step toward equalizing the present unbalanced situation.

There are other arguments, such as that drawn from a comparison with the equal voice exercised by all in the political field under a democratic form of government—to which, they say, would seem to correspond an equal voice for all interested parties in the economic field; from the danger that without a responsible voice in production man becomes a mere slave to his machine, or from the sheer expediency point of view, keeping the worker from turning to communism, which promises him so much that he does not now have. But these are side arguments, rather rhetorical in nature, and not solid enough to stand up under fire. One element which is not taken into consideration by the sociologists is the well-known tendency of workers all over the world to look for increased security without the burden of increased responsibility. But that would probably be answered on the ground of principle, i. e., even if the worker doesn't know what is best for him, that does not argue that it is not best.

Against:

The opponents of the right of co-determination enter the fray with several initial advantages. First of all, they are for the most part better acquainted with the practical problems of running a business, which puts them in a better position to see what works and what does not work. Secondly, they can point to various examples of poorly judged applications of the principles of co-determination, which have had un-

a strangle-hold on the works councils. Its advocacy of the right of co-determination is thus interpreted as a desire to get more than its share of power into its own hands.

Position of Church

All this puts the Church in Germany in a peculiarly delicate position. Its first aim, of course, is that justice be done on all sides, which is always a difficult thing to accomplish. Secondly, it wants to preserve its reputation of being the friend of the working class. In so doing it is advocating fundamentally the same measures that the socialists do, but it must do so with more regard for the rights of the other side.

In this position Catholic social theorists cannot fail to see that the implications of this "right" should develop, as it were, from within, by voluntary agreements rather than by legislation. According to this, then, the function of legislation would be to lay down the necessary prerequisites for exercising the right of co-determination. An added function of legislation would be to see that the right is guaranteed where natural development does not bring it about, and to see that agreements once made are kept. This, together with the desire that the "right" should be implemented gradually and not by any radical changes, constitutes a fairly reasonable middle position.

But neither side in the controversy (unions or business) is particularly satisfied with fairly reasonable middle positions. The Church is in its traditional position of being considered too conservative by one side and too radical by the other. One way to keep both sides happy, or at least to keep them off one's neck, is to take refuge in vague generalities, which can always be qualified when the air clears sufficiently for the purpose. In the meantime it permits one to answer a really clinching

argument from either side with, "That's not what we meant."

5. The Arguments

Against this background of vagueness with regard to precisely what is demanded we can set down a few of the main arguments for and against the right of co-determination as the discussion stands today. Among theorists it is in general the sociologists who favor the "right," and the political economists who oppose it.¹

For:

1. Changes in work and in social relations connected with it during the past century have resulted in the laborer becoming more and more a stranger to his work (a point about which Marx hit the nail on the head). If man is to retrieve his dignity, his labor must cease to be merely an economic factor and become a spiritual factor in his life—in a way consonant with modern industrial production (which is presumably here to stay).

His labor must serve not only his economic needs but also the unfolding and development of his personality in the material world. In his very capacity as worker he must find an outlet for creative power, for ideas and ideals. The present position of the worker in the modern industrial world makes the development of personality in work practically impossible—threatening at the same time to choke even the development of his spiritual powers.

A remedy must be found for this condition, and it is not to be found

¹ All the arguments here given for both sides are taken from the writings of Catholic theorists. Strictly speaking no hard and fast line can be drawn between those who favor and those who oppose legislation on the subject, but it can be seen that the arguments in favor are to a great extent sociological, whereas the contrary arguments are mainly economic.

happy results. These very advantages, however, can, in the theoretical argument seem like a disadvantage, since it keeps them from ever really coming to terms with the arguments from principle. But it is to be remembered that they are not too much interested in the merits of a theory which calls for economic co-determination at some future date and as a result of a gradual developing process. They are faced with the very concrete demands of labor, which wants the right immediately and on its own terms.

When the socialists go so far as to demand that the workers should have a say in choosing the very manager of a business, it is small wonder that capital finds little time to examine the merits of abstract arguments based on the dignity of man. They are not too much concerned with refuting the arguments of sociologists but are very much concerned with combating the power politics of the socialists and the union. They claim that in practice the workers' representatives in each plant will be representatives of the union and that to give these a deliberative voice in economic affairs would be equivalent to establishing a giant interlocking directorate controlled by the union. And it must be admitted in all fairness that some of the tactics of the union seem to lend weight to this contention. The arguments of capital, therefore, are generally calculated to prove the impossibility of implementing the right of co-determination and to throwing doubts on its adequacy for obtaining the end it is supposed to further.

Economic Vote Unwarranted

1. It is impossible for the worker to assume the risk which is inherent in any capital enterprise. This argument is derived from an analysis of the end product and of the various stages in its development. In each stage there is

question of disposing of that which is the property only of the owner. The worker contributes his share to the end product, and that share, they claim, is amply compensated by a just wage. To demand more than that is to demand a right over that which one does not own. This, of course, is based on the assumption that the worker is demanding a voice in the day-to-day running of the business and that he has neither the necessary knowledge, ability or desire to assume the necessary responsibility for this. When presented with the more limited demand for a voice only in those decisions which immediately affect the welfare of the worker, they reply that this is simply not the way the thing works out, or else they deny that a law can make the necessary qualifications which would limit the demand.

2. The representation of the workers by elements outside the plant (unions, works councils) tends to increase rather than decrease anonymity in industry, bring the average worker no nearer to his work than he was before and in no way increasing his sense of human dignity. Even if labor adheres to its proposal that representatives be chosen only from workers employed in the plant itself, they say, in practice these representatives will be controlled by elements outside the plant.

3. As for the claim that workers have the necessary knowledge and the ability to assume the responsibility which goes with a deliberative voice, they say it simply contradicts the known facts. Perhaps these things can be acquired—and they do advocate special training for those workers who manifest the capabilities—still, that doesn't change the present situation, nor make the present demands any less dangerous.

Tends to Socialism

4. Legislation such as the type demanded would be the first step toward socializing industry, the death of free

enterprise. It is possible only in a rigidly controlled economy, and they point triumphantly to England or (not so triumphantly) to their own controlled economy under national socialism to show how bad that can be.

To all of which the Catholic social theorists who advocate the right of co-determination will reply in the words of Fr. von Nell-Breuning: "Christian social teaching and the Christian social movement are not concerned principally with the most perfect economic structure in the sense of 'the absolutely most perfect methods of production,' but with human values. Should it happen that these can be bought or secured only at the cost of certain economic disadvantages, then this price must be paid."

One further point, on which theorists for both sides at least cross swords—though they do not approach it on a common ground—is the relation of the right of co-determination to the natural law. The sociologist admits that it is not a right founded in the natural law, in the sense that society could not exist without it, in the way, for example, that such institutions as the family, the state and the right of private property are founded in the natural law. But, they say, it can be founded in the natural law in the sense that social life and the common good in a particular time and under particular circumstances demand it. Whether social life and the common good at the present time and in the present circumstances do demand it, they say, is not a question for the theorist to decide (thus drawing their very neat distinction between *Soziallehre* and *Sozialpolitik*, social theory and social policy).

The economist in his very down-to-earth way takes refuge in the right of property, which, he says, is violated by the so-called right of co-determination; therefore, that right is not based on the natural law.

6. Conclusion

From even this brief and all-too-rapid survey it will be seen, we hope, that both sides are arguing somewhat at cross purposes. On the one hand proponents do not prove that the desired legislation is the only means or even an adequate means for securing the end in view. Opponents, on the other hand, do not prove, except by the technique of reiterated assertion and a few examples of unfortunate experiences, that the worker is really incapable of possessing the necessary knowledge or of assuming the necessary responsibility.

Both sides labor under the difficulty of meaning something entirely different when they speak of the right of co-determination. Proponents say that this right, whether it be in social, personnel or economic matters, will be limited to questions, in which a decision immediately affects the welfare of the workers, though they are not too clear as to just what such questions are. Opponents assume that what is demanded is a voice in the day-to-day running of the business and do not bother to consider (at least publicly) the implications of the far more limited demands.

One last word on the present outlook. Will the right of co-determination be made into law by the present Bundestag at Bonn?

Because of the political setup in Germany, which makes it necessary to keep all parties happy, it looks very much as though it will. And here capital seems to be justified in its fears, for if this "right" does become law, it will probably be in the form advocated by the socialists and the union. It is extremely doubtful whether such a law will contain the necessary guarantees with regard to the capabilities of the representatives to assume their prerogative of a deliberative voice, to say nothing of the desired limitations in the extent to which this voice can be exercised.

The editor of Serviço Social, São Paulo, Brazil, surveys the social attitudes of the Brazilian hierarchy as manifested in two joint pastorals issued at widely separated times.

SOCIAL ATTITUDES OF THE BRAZILIAN HIERARCHY

An Examination of Two Joint Pastoral Letters

Roberto Saboia de Medeiros, S.J.
São Paulo, Brazil

TWO EPISCOPAL documents will contain all the material we need for our subject.

In 1915 the hierarchy of Brazil issued the first of these, a *Pastoral Colectiva* in which they devoted two long chapters (IX and X) to social problems. Many years later, in 1945, the Episcopate of that time published the second, a *Manifesto*,* which they supplemented the following year with a program of social works.

In between these two dates there have been many letters and instructions issued by individual bishops. There have also been many concrete social projects undertaken. But the two documents referred to above are the principal joint utterances and are representative of dominating social attitudes at the two periods. Let us analyze them briefly.

I

The *Pastoral Colectiva* is an interesting document to examine after the passage of 35 years. It is characteristic of the general attitude of the period and looks upon the social question as a quite

limited problem that can be rather readily handled with a certain amount of good will. Consequently it manifests little realization of the implications of the problem: the significance of economic structure, the vast sociological complexities, the importance of helping workers to secure a certain amount of self-determination.

Chapter IX, entitled, "The Working Class," after proclaiming that only "religious discipline" is qualified to summon both classes (employers and workers) to the observance of their mutual duties, tells priests, pastors and preachers that they must care for and direct the workers and *defend their rights*. "In our difficult times there is probably no other question which should so much command the attention of our clergy." (No. 1557).

Yet the first injunctions of this same document are distinctly conservative. The "defenders of rights" are directed to teach the people, and especially the "lower classes" the duty of avoiding seditious movements, such as socialism and communism. (No. 1558).

Must Improve Conditions

The workers should be content with a modest life; they should cultivate religion and the fear of God, and in the

*See: Raymundo Ozanam de Andrade, "Manifesto of the Brazilian Hierarchy, SOCIAL ORDER, 2 (May, 1949) 193-94.

performance of religious duties they will "find consolation for the hardships of this life." (No. 1560).

But once these truths have been made clear, everything should be done to better the economic and social conditions of the working class. First, salaries should be just. What precisely does this mean? The conservative answer indicates the heated discussions that were then current. Here is what the Bishops answer: "... just wages, that is, sufficient for the worker's own support and in proportion to his work . . . and also, as far as possible, the needs of the workers' families should come into the consideration, according to [the requirements of] well-ordered charity." (No. 1562).

How great a change had come about in the course of 30 years can be seen from a momentary glance at the words of the 1945 *Manifesto* on this same point. In that year the hierarchy again spoke of a living wage. This time the wage spoken of *must* suffice to support all dependents, and at much more than a mere subsistence level. "A living wage must be paid, that is one sufficient for the needs of the worker and his family, for the support and education of the children." (*Brazilian Ecclesiastical Review*, 5 [1945] 423).

Demand Some Legislation

Returning to the pastoral of 1915, we find that the Bishops, besides speaking of a just wage, deplored conditions which required the work of children under 14, girls under 16 and of expectant mothers. They not only protested against such conditions, (No. 1565-66), but outlined briefly the kind of legislation that should be passed to benefit the children and wives of "our poor workers," and to protect them against disabilities. (No. 1567). In the meantime pastors should be kind and charitable and should make special collections for the benefit of the injured. (No. 1568).

The Bishops further recommend the avoidance of strikes which bring "such huge losses to employers, factories and industrial corporations." (No. 1569). They call for the establishment of trade schools and night schools so that the workers can acquire "know-how," develop their skills—and chiefly, "learn more thoroughly the truths of religion." (No. 1570).

In the social and economic field the only more modern approach to the question is to be found not in this chapter of the Pastoral, but in the preceding chapter in which the Bishops, alarmed at the "great evil" of usury and the "accumulation of enormous profits by unjust means," recommend the foundation of Raiffeisen banks,¹ cooperatives, credit unions and societies "that lend money to the poor and come to their aid in case of need."

Attitude Ahead of Nation

All this manifests a mentality that was not keenly alive to the whole problem. To understand this attitude we must remember that industry in Brazil was undeveloped and widely scattered in 1915. The country as a whole felt no special preoccupation with industrial problems. Disturbances by workers were thought of largely as a problem for the police rather than for social reformers.

When we consider the social climate of Brazil in those days, the Bishops, conservative as they were, manifest an attitude very much in advance of the general social spirit of the country. It is to be noted that some of their recommendations were not enacted into

¹ Friedrich Wilhelm Raiffeisen (1818-1888), who, after the economic collapse of 1846-47 in Germany, began the system of agricultural banks and credit societies to provide credit for small peasant proprietors. His system, named for him, spread to Italy, India and South America. Ed.

law until the Vargas regime, some 20 years later.

Yet Very Cautious

For all these reasons we can consider No. 1572, which is the first section of Chapter X, "Catholic Associations and Social Action," to be typical in its cautious wording of recommendations. This is what it directs:

"Wishing to cooperate as much as we can in the improvement of conditions among the social classes, in accordance with repeated instructions from the Holy See, we understand that, with due precautions, and always under the inspiration and the direction of the diocesan bishops, the clergy and the faithful must not abstain from Catholic social action."

"... due precautions" and "... not abstain," even though five years before Pope Pius X had written to His Eminence, the Cardinal of Rio de Janeiro, a special letter stressing the importance of Catholic social action as a responsibility imposed by Christian charity and the gravity of the situation, something to be undertaken immediately. The *Epistula* is dated December 17, 1910. (*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 3 [1911] 310-313).

But the hierarchy of Brazil seemed to be a little afraid of launching too ambitious a movement: "not to abstain"!

Workers to be Organized

At the same time, however, they call for the immediate establishment of confessional (i.e., Catholic) associations and circles of workers, all of them to be federated in a national center. (No. 1574-78). They make provisions for the education of the clergy in social problems and direct that in the teaching of pastoral theology should be included lectures on sociology and "on everything that contributes to the formation of a Brazilian citizen, such

as the explanation of his rights and duties, the spirit of the constitution, the importance of the vote, and so on." (No. 1579). All this is to be fitted into pastoral theology.

Then they turn their attention to the question of social action. "Social action . . . is a true apostolate for the honor and glory of Jesus Christ, as its purpose is to restore all things in Christ." (No. 1586).

Hence, promoters and directors must be excellent Catholics, entirely obedient to their pastors (No. 1583-85) and well informed concerning the papal encyclicals (which are listed in No. 1587-89). Finally, Catholic social action should keep abreast of advances in social and economic sciences and should profit from the experience of workers in other countries, "applying them to our social conditions." (No. 1590).

Primarily Religious

Social action was always understood in the light of the encyclical, *Il fermo proposito*. The dominating preoccupation seems to have been to protect the worker from the infiltration of socialism and anarchism, of insisting on the fulfillment of religious obligations, of keeping the workers within the Church. All these objectives seemed to be more urgent than any direct effort to improve economic and social conditions.

This same attitude is manifested clearly in the paragraphs about employers and the rich:

"Employers must not compel their employees to work excessively or beyond their strength; they must give them extra pay for extra services, especially when profits have been unusually high. They must remember that the poor are not slaves of the rich and that all will be brought before the same tribunal of God." (No. 1564). Again, "... we protest against the inhumanity that can be seen in some factories and plants

in which excessive burdens are laid upon the workers. . . This is a brutal imposition . . . that corrupts heart and soul." (No. 1565).

But the strong words are an exhortation: the thought does not occur that these things could be made the objective of "Catholic social action" or of a just strike.

II

By 1945 progress in social attitudes had been very great. Throughout the whole Catholic world social doctrine had made tremendous progress because of the experiences gained in the intervening years and of prolonged consideration given to the ideas contained in the social encyclicals. In the years between the two episcopal statements Pius XI has issued, among other documents, his justly famous social manifesto, *Quadragesimo Anno*.

As a result of all these changes, the episcopal *Manifesto* of 1945 and the Social Program of 1946 were profoundly different and electrified public attention in Brazil. In at least one aspect, moreover, they achieved a speedy pioneering result.

The new Constitution of the United States of Brazil, which was voted on late in 1946, has a special paragraph on profit-sharing. The inclusion of this subject in the Constitution is due entirely to two lines in the 1945 *Manifesto* in which the Bishops ask: "Would it not be reasonable that the workers, in addition to a just wage, should receive some kind of proportional participation in the firm's profits?"

This simple question gave rise to a tremendous amount of interest and discussion. There were many conflicting opinions and a certain amount of demagoguery. But the most significant result was the commendatory passage about profit sharing in the Constitution. It has brought about a rapid spread of information about the whole question—and some practical action.

Condemns Social Evils

The *Manifesto* speaks clearly and forcefully about the maldistribution of wealth. In describing the situation in Brazil, it quotes the well-known statement of the American hierarchy, "The Church and Social Order," which was issued by the National Catholic Welfare Conference. (*Brazilian Ecclesiastical Review*, 5 [1945] 421).

Social legislation in Brazil receives due praise, but the document reminds readers that the social question will not be solved until the remuneration of labor is sufficient to give workers the opportunity to secure at least a small piece of property. When a man has property, they state, he will be free, to a degree, from economic dependence and from any danger of economic slavery, whether it be under private capital or under a state totalitarianism. (p. 423).

The Bishops also desire that rural workers, who up to that time had been neglected, be looked after. The technical advantages of industry must be extended, wherever feasible, to rural areas also. Consequently, a movement of rural education must be started at once to raise the educational level and to make the rural population alive to its own needs. (p. 424).

"The great crusade of modern times is the elevation of the proletariat . . . This is the way to re-Christianize modern society; . . . this is the mission of Catholic Action, always so intimately bound up with social action" (*Ibid.*).

Present Social Program

The following year (1946), the hierarchy published a detailed, practical Program, which is positive, constructive and forward-looking. Point by point the Bishops give instructions about social work, the problem of infant mortality and the protection of mothers, about disrupted families, about adult education, the social formation of youth in schools, about workers' organization in

Circles, about the rural problem and the conservative classes. There is a word of advice for everybody and about every problem.

But the underlying principle, which comes to light toward the end of the document, is the really important point.

"The transforming measures which we propose are ideally adapted to secure the end which we greatly desire, namely, that our society be rebuilt in such a way that everyone is given the opportunity of securing, *by his own effort* and those of the community working in solidarity, a level of material and spiritual well-being which gives stability and tranquillity to the family and to the individual human being." (*Ibid.*, 6 [1946] 483; italics supplied above).

In 1949 an archdiocesan synod met in Rio de Janeiro. One of the decrees of this synod applied the principle of individual personal action brilliantly: "It is necessary to stimulate Catholic workers to discuss their own temporal and spiritual problems with a view to recalling those who have left the Church and to getting at practical solutions to our social problems, solutions which are in conformity with the Christian spirit of social justice and of collective harmony."

Other Evidences

This presentation of the social attitudes of the Brazilian hierarchy may be somewhat deceptive. We have analyzed only two important documents. The impression might be given that interest in the social question is not strong in Brazil.

But in the interval between the two joint pastorals there have been numerous pastorals and instructions issued by individual Bishops. These have dealt with various social problems and have made numerous recommendations.

In most of the parishes, too, various kinds of social works are carried on. The Circles (*Círculos Operários*), founded by Rev. L. Brentano, S. J., have

a large membership throughout the country, and the J.O.C. (Catholic Workers Youth Organization) takes an active part in the social apostolate. The Bishops have sponsored and blessed all these activities and have established in the larger dioceses Departments of Social Work.

Trade Unions

What about the trade unions?

This is still something of a burning question in Brazil. The Vargas regime inaugurated a sort of trade union, *sindicato*, which is controlled by the Ministry of Labor. Catholic leaders protested against this action from the beginning. They not only objected to government control of labor organizations but stated that the Catholic social doctrine preferred a pluralism of unions, *sindicatos*. But they were unable to prevent government action. At the present time there is no legal way of establishing Christian *sindicatos* alongside the official organization.

Under the circumstances the solution hit upon was to organize the Circles that were mentioned above. These groups have no recognized, official standing and cannot legally represent the workers in collective bargaining. They are somewhat like the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, (A.C.T.U.), in English-speaking countries.

Take Over Unions

Another solution to the problem that was attempted was to encourage Catholic workers to join the *sindicato* in large numbers so as gradually to give them a totally Catholic leadership. To a certain extent the attempt was made, and it met with partial success. Both solutions received encouragement from the Bishops.

Some think that since the workers are, as yet, unprepared to manage their own organizations, the existing situation is a fairly satisfactory expedient. For the present, they say, it is better to leave things as they are.

Others call attention to the fact that Brazilians are rather adverse to being "organized" anyway, and, since the *sindicato* is not very popular, they doubt whether any solution to the problem of the worker will be worked out through such organizations.

Preparing Leaders

A "Social Action Week" which was held at Recife in 1946 came to the conclusion (approved officially by the Archbishop of Recife) that one of the most urgent tasks confronting Catholic social action was to open small labor schools in all localities. These schools will have the responsibility of preparing the leaders who will be able to assume positions of importance in workers' organizations and work more actively for the redemption of the working class.

On the other hand, the workers in Brazil, for all their deficiencies—their illiteracy and their moral shortcomings—are still profoundly Christian in their outlook. They are devoted to the Church and respectful to their pastors. Under such circumstances it would be a blunder uncritically to apply here in Brazil, methods which have been effec-

tive elsewhere in quite different circumstances.

Conclusion

You could conclude and summarize this whole subject by saying that the social attitudes of the Brazilian hierarchy have been a faithful echo of the Brazilian Catholic attitude in general. They have attempted wisely and prudently to apply Catholic social principles to the particular situation that confronted them in this country.

It must be admitted that the hierarchy has been more concerned with the religious than with the social and economic aspects of the worker's life. But that is only what should be expected from religious leaders. And at the same time it must be recognized that their emphasis upon religious questions has inevitably called attention to social issues.

Improvement of religious conditions has had repercussions in socio-economic areas. At the same time there has been a steady, if not too emphatic, pressure for more direct social reform.

And if you understand the character of the people of Brazil you will recognize that the hierarchy has been wise—and to the point.

Democracy Needs Community

The assumption behind democracy is that there is such a thing as a community—men and women living a social life in natural groups—the family, neighborhood groups, cultural associations of all kinds: that in such a community men can develop and express their personalities.

A. D. LINDSAY

SOCIAL ORDER

Mr. Joseph B. Schuyler, S.J., an associate editor of SOCIAL ORDER, reviews an institution which has a tremendous potential influence upon your life.

YOU AND THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Its Origins, Job and Controversial History

Joseph B. Schuyler, S.J.
Woodstock College

SHORTLY AFTER this article appears, three men in Washington will hand to President Truman a document that will claim the attention of many million Americans. The three men are the President's Council of Economic Advisers,¹ and the document is their legally required report to him, *The Annual Economic Review*. Established by the Employment Act of 1946, the CEA with its small staff of economists studies the condition of American economic life (employment and production, prices, wages and profits, money and credit, etc.), analyzes its strength and defects, and on the basis of its analysis recommends certain economic policies. The President is free to include or omit

these recommendations in his own *Economic Report* given to the newly convened Congress.

The proposal to establish such a Council was objected to five years ago, and criticisms have not abated. Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, first CEA chairman, resigned his position because of disagreements about the Council's functioning. The Council is important enough and the issues big enough to merit some careful consideration of all this controversy. In this article I can only hit some of the larger issues, but it's worth our time and effort.

Watchtower or Planning Group?

Just how important is the CEA and

¹ Writings of value on this subject include: Stephen Bailey's, *Congress Makes a Law—The Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946*, (Columbia University Press, 1950); articles by Edwin Nourse in the *American Economic Review*, (May, 1947), in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, (Vol. 94, No. 4, 1950), in *Collier's*, (February 18, 1950); by Nourse and Bertram Gross in *The American Political Science Review* (April, 1948); a pair of articles by Paul Strayer and Roy Blough, with an answer by Nourse, in the *American Economic Review*, (May, 1950); by J. Viner in the *Review of Economic Statistics*, (May, 1947) and by T. Wilson et

al., *ibid.*, (August, 1949); by M. Bronfenbrenner in *Journal of Political Economy*, (October, 1948); also the *Annual Reports*, and annual and midyear *Economic Reviews* submitted by the Council to the President; also various speeches of Leon Keyserling, chairman of the CEA.

Most helpful to me in preparing this article were interviews in the CEA's offices, particularly with Bertram Gross, Council's Executive Secretary, who was vitally active in employment legislation since its inception; and with Dr. Nourse, former CEA chairman, in his office in Washington.

its work? What caused its creation five years ago? Has it performed the task assigned to it? Is it true that the Council has lost sight of the unemployment problem, initial reason for its creation? Is it true that the CEA uses its own authority, or has itself been used as a political trumpet? Are its members missionaries for a planned economy? Has the Council done its job competently so as to be worth its keep?

These questions, occasionally with implied charges, have been asked about the CEA. *SOCIAL ORDER* uses them not only as an occasion to give some answers, but to discuss with its readers the nature and function of a government body capable of making important contributions to our national life. Actually many of the questions asked above have reassuring answers when examined dispassionately. Some remain, however, and they lead to a couple of other problems within the Council's operating status which we shall discuss below.

Feared Unemployment

The prolonged depression of the '30's was a nightmare the American people never want repeated. At its worst, over 15,000,000 looked vainly for work despite government remedies, and even as late as the start of the pre-war defense boom nearly 10,000,000, including the sole breadwinners of almost 6,000,000 families, were without work. Of course the war economy eliminated unemployment. But many worried about its return after the war. Economists widely predicted the usual post-war boom inevitably to be followed by a bad depression. That concern was general is evident from the 36,000 papers submitted in the Pabst essay contest on post-war employment, from the *Fortune* poll in 1944, and from the Library of Congress' packed 56-page bibliography of "full-employment" writings between 1943 and 1945. Many government agencies, too, had instituted plans to-

ward the same goal, and many countries included "full employment" and/or "right to work" clauses in their statute books. So did the U.N. itself in its charter.

Along with its concern over post-war employment, our government had also long been trying to find a coordinator of its sprawling agencies and an institution to lay the groundwork for long-range planning. The Executive Office of the President, legally established through the Reorganization Act of 1939, partially satisfied this need. These two aims, then, of providing post-war full-employment and an organ of coordination and planning, underlay the creation of the CEA—after much legislative maneuvering, as we shall see.

Origins of Bill

In 1943, at the war's height, legislation began which culminated in the establishment of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to oversee the change from war to peacetime economy. Despite agitation to include provision for broad unemployment compensation and full-employment planning, these measures were rejected when the OWMR Act passed in October of 1944. Thereupon, Montana's Senator James Murray began shaping the rejected measure into a Full Employment Bill, canvassing both public and private agencies for opinions and support.

Meanwhile in the presidential electoral campaigns of 1944, both parties pledged employment promises—the victorious Democrats actually including in their platform the words: "To . . . guarantee full employment." President Roosevelt spoke in similar vein, recognizing the right to employment and promising a program to provide 60,000,000 productive jobs. During the late fall of 1944, Murray's men worked on drafting the bill. They struggled to clarify the ambiguous concept of "full employment," and to agree on the means which the government would use to

provide jobs. The theory of compensatory spending to produce jobs seems to have been in highest favor, but all other known job-producing methods at the disposal of both government and private business were also included. Profiting from experience, the drafters placed responsibility for economic analysis and planning with the President (preferably in the Bureau of the Budget) rather than with Congress, though the latter would have a Joint Committee to study and report on the President's information.

Murray lined up as co-sponsors, Senators Wagner, O'Mahoney and Thomas (and later Republicans Morse, Tobey, Langer and Aiken) who revised the bill somewhat. Finally, the Full Employment Bill, establishing the "right to work," the government's obligation to guarantee work opportunities—and the respective responsibilities of the President and Congress—was introduced as S.380 in January, 1945.

Objectives Compromised

The ensuing battle over the bill saw all the political maneuvers used to push or hinder legislation—indeed, the battle manifested the basic division in American politico-economic thought. Even discounting the exaggerated claims and fears of opposing partisans, the basic conflict was between sincere proponents of government's positive obligations to underwrite public prosperity when necessary, and sincere opponents of government's further interference in economic life. The former decried "boom and bust," "poverty and plenty" in the world's richest nation; the latter feared the dictatorship inherent in what they believed must become a planned economy. Many also opposed the emphasis given to compensatory spending—for economic as well as political reasons.

Although the Senate passed a revised, but substantially unaltered bill in September, a series of tactical blunders led to House passage in December of a very

much weakened bill, H.R. 2202. The "right to work," "full employment" and "government guarantee" elements were eliminated from the House's bill.

Planning for Free Enterprise

The Employment Act of 1946, fruit of compromises by the Joint Conference Committee on S.380 and H.R. 2202, became Public Law 304 in February. Almost all parties professed satisfaction that the law met their own requirements—which means that the phrasing of controverted elements is sufficiently elastic to permit contrary interpretations.

What is the Act all about?

It gives to the federal government responsibility for maximum employment. That means that it may use all its resources and means (so long as free competitive enterprise and the public welfare are not endangered) to keep people employed.

And what is the Council's job?

The Council, which is composed of three men, with their staff, have a three-fold task. It is 1. to analyze and interpret economic developments, 2. appraise programs and activities in the government (insofar as they promote or hinder maximum employment and the economy), and 3. formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise.

Report State of Economy

The results of this continuing survey are to be presented to the President in semi-annual reports.

The President is to submit the Council's report and his own to the Congress. Within Congress, a special Committee on the Economic Report, composed of seven senators and seven representatives, studies these reports, evaluates the recommendations, and in turn reports to the two Houses.

This whole elaborate procedure, in which each step serves as a check upon the others, must be kept in mind when we reflect upon charges that the Council is potentially dangerous and that it may lead us to socialism or to undue interference in the affairs of business.

The Joint Committee provides a coordinating link between the economic thinking of the White House and that of Capitol Hill.

Slightly less than half the Act comprises Section 4 which establishes the independent CEA in the President's Executive Office. The three members of the Council are to be chosen on the basis of their professional attainments and ability. Provided with a limited staff of experts, the Council's function is to assist the President in preparing his economic report, to analyze and synthesize all available economic data in the light of the Act's policy, to formulate for the President's use policies to promote a free, growing, but stable economy and to submit such studies as the President requests, in addition to their annual report each December. The Council may constitute and confer with various advisory committees (from all walks of the nation's economic life), and it should use information supplied by already existing public and private agencies as much as possible.

Subject to Scrutiny

Already, from what has been said, we can readily answer some of the questions posed earlier in this article. The CEA, which is, in ex-chairman Nourse's words, "a new attempt to make free enterprise work in a system of free government," is valuable as a professional organ of analysis of the economy and the various government activities affecting the economy. By law it has to adhere to a philosophy of free competitive enterprise joined with promotion of the common welfare. The President is free to use the Council's recommenda-

tions as he pleases—just as the Congress is free to use the President's program as it pleases. As a matter of fact, the Council's concern is essentially economic, though within the general social framework; the President alone, faced by political and other considerations, uses the Council's plans accordingly. Hence, although it is a central planning agency, the CEA is purely advisory, has no administrative power nor supervision over the President's policies. It is subject in its work to the sharp-eyed criticism of the public and especially the entire profession of economists.

Danger of Socialism

There are those who fear that the Council may easily become the coordinating cog in the running of a socialist-orientated planned economy. The possibilities are there, of course, as they are in any political democracy. And the Council's preoccupation with the total economy gives it a peculiarly advantageous position for planning and control.

But so long as the Council's recommendations must run the gantlet of the President's offices, the Joint Committee, other committees, and open debate on the floor of both houses, there is not much likelihood that the Council could take over unduly. Besides, its recommendations will always be subject to the scrutiny of public opinion and the far more searching analysis of its professional peers. If the day should come when the Council becomes a planning and regulatory body, it will be because the country at large has acquiesced in such a transition.

On the other hand, the Council would in all likelihood assume a much more significant role during any serious crisis, such as a depression similar in magnitude to the 1929 catastrophe or a total war. But these new responsibilities would be authorized by special legislation and would terminate with the crisis.

Government and Business

There has always been some government influence in our economic life, e. g., taxes and tariff, parcel post, banking laws, etc., despite the earlier preponderance of *laissez-faireism* and the consistent popular opposition to political control of the economy. As the delicate relations between the economy's operations and the government's ward, namely the public welfare, have grown more complex (and in the absence of any such responsible economic autonomy as Industrial Councils might provide) further government participation in economic life has been inevitable. This is evident in its monetary and fiscal policies, social security, regulation of commerce and securities, public works, etc.

There is, of course, danger of both excess and defect in such participation. Up to the present, however, in the Council's work "economic planning" has meant an appraisal of the free economy's ability to provide for the public prosperity and, in the event of its failure, a readiness to take up the slack either by stimulating private business or by temporary expansion of its own economic activities.

In the spring of 1950, for example, an estimate showed that within 5 years the labor force will have increased by 12,000,000. If private business provides the additional jobs to employ those 12,000,000, fine. If not, the nation's government will have a problem on its hands. Government, guardian and promoter of the public welfare, must know whether the problem will exist, and if so, how to meet it.

The CEA's concern with unemployment has been primary and constant as part of their chief charge to work toward stabilization of a sound economy. The fact that their emphasis is on the economy as a whole rather than the particular problem of unemployment derives from the law itself. For

good and bad reasons the Full Employment Bill was watered down to the current law, and the CEA acts accordingly. Each of its *Annual Economic Reviews* (and midyear reports) has highlighted the employment situation, but within the general economic framework.

Attitude of Economists

Economists have generally praised the Council for a good presentation of the facts required for appraising the state of the economy and for most of the President's economic policies on which both he and the Council agreed.

Economists have been sharply divided on other phases of the Council and its work. Some opponents object to any spontaneous government interest in the health of business. Others have criticized, too, the degree or the kind of intervention the Council has recommended. Others dislike alleged attempts to predict economic developments in the immediate future or an unnecessary preoccupation with social measures unrelated to the problem of maintaining stability.

Some of these criticisms spring from misunderstanding of the role assigned to the Council by law. Thus, individual economists have attacked efforts to "predict" future economic developments. Such an attack results from a two-fold misunderstanding. In the first place, the Council has made no predictions; Dr. Nourse, when he accepted the Chairmanship, stated that the Council would make predictions "over his dead body." Secondly, the attempt to indicate economic trends and to suggest their effect upon business in the event that they continued (which attempts were erroneously called predictions), was one of the responsibilities given the Council by Congress.

Larger Issues

Others stem from forthright differences of opinion about the place of

the Council in government. One group looks upon it as an arm of the administration which should be conformed to the president's economic policies; the other group believes that the Council should have "the unique nonpolitical role of making the conscientious scholar a technical aide to the executive branch or of bringing scientific analysis actively into the consideration of policy alternatives."

Still others have their origin in differing economic theories. Such criticisms would be concerned generally with specific recommendations and would involve, for instance, questions about the degree or the type of government intervention that a given economic situation demanded—or the fact of need itself.

Another charge against the Council—and this brings us to the heart of CEA controversies—is that it has not effectively promoted the programs it has recommended. Some critics claim that the Council should actively sponsor its recommendations and be ready to support the President's program before congressional committees. Others, especially among economists themselves, think that such a policy detracts from the Council's independence, even while increasing its influence temporarily. Council members, Leon Keyserling, the present chairman, John Clark and Roy Blough have agreed with the former position; former chairman Edwin Nourse disagrees strongly and resigned his place on the Council just over a year ago chiefly because of this disagreement.

Nourse vs. Administration

The position of Dr. Nourse, formerly of Brookings Institute and one of America's most respected and experienced economists, is simply this. The Council is essentially a body of professional economists engaged in the profession's most honorable task, namely, advising the President on economic pol-

icy. The law, respecting the separation of executive and legislative powers, places the Council specifically in the Executive Office to do its work unimpeded, thus freeing it from the "politicizing" of congressional hearings (often ruthlessly unobjective). Though the members are directly under the President's command, Congress has the benefit of their work in the presidential economic report to Congress, and Congressmen are both invited to sit in on Council activities and to seek Council advice in a non-political atmosphere. So, even though Senator Murray, originator of the bill, intended that the Council should be available for congressional hearings, Dr. Nourse insists that the law itself quite rightly points in the other direction. Often enough, he explains, the President will not follow the Council's recommendation. Testifying thereon before a congressional committee, a Council member would be exposed either to stultifying himself or embarrassing the President—a choice Nourse suggests faced his colleagues when they testified during the early 1949 recession while the President was advocating anti-inflation controls.

Discount Own Theories

Likewise, he adds, in his service to the President, the Council member must put aside his own economic philosophy and pet ideas. The law commits him to a philosophy of public welfare development within a free economy. His recommendations must be made on that basis, and if they are not accepted he must be big and humble enough to take that as part of his job. Precisely because his colleagues disagreed with him on this understanding of the Council's function, and because the President gave little sign of knowing how to use a nonpolitical arm of professional advisers, Nourse considered that he had to leave the Council.

Administration Views

His former colleagues frankly admit the disagreement. They consider the Council as part of the executive team. Government means political leadership, and unless they participate in the development and exercise of that leadership, why belong to government? If wedded to basic ideas which the President does not accept, the self-respecting Council member should resign. If the Executive and Council do agree, then the latter should use every effort to promote the President's program. The current members are apparently agreed on this approach, and rather enthusiastically await the coming session of Congress as the first chance to throw their weight into congressional deliberations.

As for the possibility of the Council advocating a dangerous course, for example, an overdose of statism and authoritarian planning, Mr. Bertram Gross, the Council's Executive Secretary during its five years, points out that the CEA is but one small government agency, that its every proposal is checked by many other departments before being accepted. As a matter of fact, though one hears occasionally that Mr. Keyserling is, or was, too "leftish" in his views*, that is certainly not sub-

stantiated in his writings and speeches which I have been able to read. On the contrary his emphasis on the need for the expansion and vitality of private business is both evident and sincere. The same philosophy has been consistently evident in all the Council's reports thus far. In fact the degree of concordance between Council's statements and the principle of subsidiarity is remarkably encouraging.

In summary, the CEA is institutionally valuable as an executive organ of professional economic study and central coordinated planning. Its annual and other reviews and reports have been valuable both for their factual analyses and practical emphasis on the union of free competitive enterprise with the promotion of general welfare. Its relations with both government agencies and private economic groups on a co-operative, non-administrative—or supervisory basis provide for more general understanding and good will. Its limitation to mere proposals of policy which come to the attention of both the President and Congress is necessary to safeguard free government.

On the other hand, the split between Nourse and the other Council members manifests a problem not solved by his resignation. Can the CEA perform an objective, professional job if its members are not independent of the wishes of the party in power—and is only a body of "kept" economists? And if they are independent, can they look for cooperation from a political chief? In other words, is professional influence compatible with political exigencies? The present Council would say yes, *so long as the economic policy of the members agrees with that of the Executive*; Dr. Nourse would say yes, *only if the President knows how to use an independent advisory body, which may disagree with some of his policies.*

*Commendation from an unexpected quarter was offered Mr. Keyserling at the third annual Conference of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, held in Cincinnati, November 30 and December 1, 1950. At a luncheon meeting on November 30, Ralph W. Robey, chief economist of the National Association of Manufacturers, included Keyserling in "a powerful conservative group in Washington which does not want to put our economy in a strait-jacket." Mr. Robey praised the group, which prefers to regulate affairs by indirect control, adequate restrictions on private credit and a sound tax program. According to the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, Robey warned his hearers that there are still others in Washington who seek an all-out program of control. Ed.

Father Duff, whose interest in the question of community is profound and enduring, believes that Professor Brownell raises a vital question but proposes no real solution.

MAN IN THE COMMUNITY AS THE MEASURE

A Review

Edward Duff, S. J.
Associate Editor, *America*

A FEW YEARS ago when Dr. Ernest O. Melby, now head of New York University's School of Education, was Chancellor of the University of Montana, he persuaded the Rockefeller Foundation to finance an experimental project to develop educational techniques for enriching human life in the small towns of the state. Called the Montana Study, the project aimed, through the formation of community self-study groups, to stabilize and reanimate local rural centers. The workings of the project have been described by Richard Waverly Poston in *Small Town Renaissance*, (Harper, New York, 1950, \$3.50).

The Director of the Montana Study was Baker Brownell, a professor and editorial writer, described by a kindred spirit, the irrepressible T. V. Smith, as "a wildcatter among sociologists and a maverick among philosophers." Now attached to the Department of Philosophy at Northwestern University, Dr. Brownell offers his reflections¹ on the problem that confronted him in his

days at the University of Montana (and confronts compellingly, in his opinion, all of us) the problem of "the disintegration of the community and its slow extinction in the western world."

Our Major Problem

There are, Dr. Brownell is aware, dramatic dangers, from atomic attack for example, threatening the country. He insists, however, that "the decline of the human community is the primary problem, the germinal problem, so to speak." In a book of impressive range (if of uneven worth) this man of immense good will explains why, supplying his philosophy—or ideology—of corporate salvation. I say ideology because Dr. Brownell's conception of the human community incorporates, however mistily, a system of social and political ideas geared to action under present conditions.

In appraising the Brownell ideology, many a reviewer will feel himself unfairly handicapped. If he is, by unfortunate preference or unhappy lot, a city dweller, he is convicted in advance of being a member of a mass society which is schizoid, specialized, atomistic, aggressive, depersonalizing, unstable, predatory, meretricious, un-

¹ Baker Brownell, *The Human Community: Its Philosophy and Practice for a Time of Crisis*. Harper & Brothers, New York, 305 pp. \$4.00.

authentic, cosmopolitan, external, decadent, destructive of total human function, segregative of ends and means, fragmentative of human purpose and development, the preserve of special interest groups. (Dr. Brownell, it will be noted, is amply supplied with adjectival aids.) Such a reviewer is in need of radical reorientation.

Era of Mechanism

It will not demand very much effort at reorientation, however, for the readers of SOCIAL ORDER to follow the main lines of Dr. Brownell's indictment of contemporary society. It is, in the main, a repetition, though somewhat more superficial and wordy, of Lewis Mumford's description of modern mechanistic civilization in terms of its architecture:

Our important architecture is an architecture of compensation: it provides grandiloquent stones for people who have been deprived of bread and sunlight and all that keeps men from becoming vile. Behind the monumental fascades of our factory system; and beyond the great cities lies a countryside whose goods are drained away, whose children are uprooted from the soil on the prospect of easy gain and endless amusements, and whose remaining cultivators are steadily drifting into the ranks of abject tenantry. This is not a casual observation: It is the translation of the last three census reports into plain English . . .

The chief thing needful for the full enjoyment of this architecture is a standardized people. Here our various educational institutions, from the advertising columns of the five-cent magazines to the higher centers of learning, from the movie to the radio, have not altogether failed the architect.²

The readers of SOCIAL ORDER also appreciate the advantages of a biodynamic civilization. They know the areas of attack. They know, to use the language of *Quadragesimo Anno*, that:

"Whereas dead matter leaves the factory ennobled and transformed, men are corrupted and degraded." They know of the social—and the economic and political—advantages of the family farm as against the farm factory. An earlier volume of this magazine³ told the story of two California communities—Arvin and Dinuba—nearly identical in size and geographical advantages but differing essentially in the size of their average farm to the striking human and commercial advantage of Dinuba, the family-farm community.

Isolated and Anonymous Man

They know that people organized according to their economic and/or class interests, however legitimate and necessary this may be, do not automatically achieve the common good. They know that bigness imperils the human proportion of living and is uneconomic as well. They know that decentralization of industry is not only feasible but a move protective of our political liberties, too. They know that modern education has emphasized individual development, fragmenting human functions and, in consequence, stunting the personality of the student. They know that the alienation of man from nature and, more important, from his fellow man has produced a creature, oppressed by his anonymity, expressing himself in restlessness and, worse, in rancor. (They know *how* that process proceeded, but let that go for the present.)

For his detailed description of the human situation, Dr. Brownell joins Ralph Borsodi and Arthur E. Morgan as benefactors of the nations. His definition of the goal—the building of the human community—is annoyingly vague and inconclusive. His concrete suggestions of how the goal is to be achieved are disappointingly unspecific and leave him vulnerable to the charge

² Lewis Mumford, *Sticks and Stones*. Boni and Liveright, 1924, pp. 147 & 186.

³ Arthur A. Barth, "A Tale of Two Cities," SOCIAL ORDER, 1 (1948) 11-13.

he would resent above all others—that of being an academician. Finally, for the question his book raises for the readers of *SOCIAL ORDER*, Dr. Brownell is to be thanked.

Characteristics of Community

As a philosopher, Baker Brownell has an abhorrence for abstractions. "Through the technique of the universal, whatever that may mean," he writes, "our western theory, as well as that of most of India, has withdrawn the sacred essences of things from the humid contexts of living." The community, he confesses, is concrete and can be perceived only "in the round," in the rich, many-side actions, procedures and intimations of living. It cannot be defined in any logico-linear, Aristotelian analysis. It must be directly "felt" and then described "in poetic or holophrastic [which just about means 'by catch-words, slogans'] modes of writing." This, Dr. Brownell admits, "verges on mysticism." Perhaps. But when Brownell continues: "Poetically, the community for us is timeless. . . It is a kind of substantive, and in the realm of human intimations and behavior, of values and initiatives, it is a focal point," one senses the intrusion of those banished, corrupting "universals," this time existing, as Plato held, in a reality, independent of thought.

If "the human community" defies non-lyrical definition, it can be specified, at least, according to its essential characteristics. These are listed by Dr. Brownell as: "1. A community is a group of neighbors who know one another face to face. 2. It is a diversified group as to age, sex, skill, function and mutual service to each other. 3. It is a cooperative group in which many of the main activities of life are carried on together. 4. It is a group having a sense of "belonging" or group identity and solidarity. 5. It is rather a small

group, such as the family, village or small town, in which each person can know a number of others as whole persons, not as functional fragments."

Further Traits

Incorporating these characteristics in a single statement, Dr. Brownell chooses the uncomplicated words, "A community is a group of persons who know one another well." A member of the Boimondau Community of Work in France found a more communitarian phrase: "The community is a real person composed of all the buddies who are in it, with their wives and children."⁴ He was struggling to express the extra something resulting from the solidarity and the social love uniting the companions and families of the Boimondau Community.

Dr. Brownell seems not to have heard of Boimondau, one of the 60 Communities of Work that have sprung up in Europe in recent years. It is a pity. (These Communities of Work are described in a book published by his own publisher.)⁵ It would have been interesting to see if such efforts to create opportunities for personal development and human freedom through common effort fulfilled his hopes. Indeed, it would have been helpful to have Dr. Brownell's judgment on something as concrete as a *kibbutzim* in Israel. Somehow the accounts of earnest study-club meetings at Montana cross-roads, however lyrically described, seem, as radical and practical remedies, hardly proportioned to "as severe a threat as any since the fall of Rome."

It is not unfair to ask so practical a philosopher as Dr. Brownell to be specific in his suggestions as to how Ameri-

⁴ Albert Dujardin, S. J., "The Boimondau Community," *SOCIAL ORDER*, 1 (1948) 245.

⁵ Claire Huchet Bishop, *All Things Common*. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

cans are to build the human community, how we are to achieve the "functional reorganization of society around the human community." Is he for Distributism as the political instrument of our liberation? There is no evidence in his bibliography that he ever heard of this British movement to break down the economic concentration of power that has produced our proletariat. (He tells us about the ancient English villages but fails to tell us how the peasants were dispossessed and "the enclosures" came into being: he has never read William Cobbett nor, apparently, heard of Henry VIII.) It is all very well to preach a plasmic sense of making contact with earth's ancient cycle—Alfred Rosenberg's more influential aberration, incidentally, used much the same words—but a philosopher cannot escape the problem of ends and means and the problem of ends (if I may be permitted a pun) comes at the beginning.

Practical Measures Needed

There is, indeed, a dismal and dismaying lack of purpose in modern living, and Dr. Brownell does well to seek a revival of devotion. "Leonidas, Arnold von Winkelried, John C. Waldron and his torpedo squadron at Midway or, in a more mystic sense, Jesus at Calvary" constitute his curious catalog of exemplars. But devotion to what? To the possibility of every child knowing "a tree with bark worn smooth by his climbing?" This may be called "mysticism," a worship of an hypostatized ideal of ruralism, but it is madness if conceived as anything effectively moving normal human beings to action or explaining the cohesion in any realizable human community. (As a judgment on the real world, it is matched by Dr. Brownell's easy identification of "the urban capitalism of New York, the urban imperialism of Paris and the urban communism of Moscow" as alike aggressive in intention. The Interna-

tional Peasants Union, a federation of Agrarian Parties of Eastern and Central Europe could supply a corrective from recent history to such intellectual unrealism.)

Some spiritual ideal is necessary if people are going to make the effort to understand each other, much less collaborate in the toilsome work of building the human community. Such is the universal testimony of the Companions of the actually existing Communities of Work in France. Said one of their number: "The Communitarian Idea is not a philosophical position, nor is it a pedestal from which we dominate the world The community is not an end, but a means" (Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 260).

Ignores Christianity

The human community, the true Temporal City of human harmony, cannot be constructed on the thin stuff of nature worship and American masculine cheeriness. Much less can it be built on the feeble foundations of outmoded, arrogant atheism, announcing: "Gods are projected evaluations. In them poetic processes are given form; pictures are thrown to the sky. They are selective scripts from the drama of our living."

This kind of talk is insolent intellectual indolence, manifested also in the conception of Jesus Christ as a peasant preacher with an attractive love of nature and a graphic gift of epigram exploited by the cosmopolitan, Paul, to cosmic stature. It is an intellectual slovenliness satisfied with derivative quotations from St. Paul and St. Augustine, a smugness confident that their actual judgments are not worth consulting. It is fashionable, doubtless, in the milieu of the City of Man to list Christianity as one of several competing tribal "myths." But it forgets that Christianity is a *mythos*, a narrative, that has appealed to thousands of millions through the centuries, not because

of the cohesion or loveliness of the story, nor the solace that it provides, not because it is the cement of the human community, nor even because it explains much that would otherwise be meaningless. It was accepted because it was true, because its assertions were justifiable historically.

There is no indication that Dr. Brownell has ever tried to verify those assertions, ever challenged those claims—a depressing discovery in a man of manifest good will who would lend his shoulder to the wheel to pull humanity from the slough of individualism—which is to say, selfishness.

Role of Religion

I said Dr. Brownell's book raised a question for the readers of SOCIAL ORDER. It is not enough to point out to a man of such manifest good will that when the transcendent ends of the person are ignored (or denied) man is inevitably reduced to a network of social functions and relations. Dr. Brownell has not bothered to read Maritain's *Integral Humanism*, undoubtedly considering it an example of the "medievalism" currently fashionable at the University of Chicago. As Jefferson Re-dividus, he deplores the loss of the community cohesiveness that spoke the meaningful phrase, "We, the People." He would not agree that the erosion of the spiritual foundations of rural human communities since Jefferson's day is due in no small part to the destruction of the whole tissue of meanings, which is religion, by intellectuals, including Jefferson, intent on emancipating man from what they assumed to be tyrannical "superstition" and succeeding in imprisoning man in an arid individualism, devoid of life-enriching goals and empty of resources for constructing a community. It is only a sacramental view of nature that gives any meaning to rural rites.

The eye of earnest atheists like Baker Brownell (he has written a book called, significantly, *Earth Is Enough*) will be caught only when Catholics show a larger awareness of the common burden of building the human community, when they recognize that theirs is an imperative obligation to work for civic unity which is, after all, a reflection and a preparation for the spiritual unity that is the Church. Perhaps the appearance in English of Père Henri de Lubac's magistral book⁶ may help. Perhaps it will take the sufferings and sacrifices and undoubted anguish of the struggle ahead of us to break down the walls and engender an understanding that must antecede any construction of the human community.

The true human community which Baker Brownell has glimpsed from afar, and which all men of good will must labor to establish was in the mind of Pius X (he who insisted, incidentally, on verifiable meaning behind all talk on "religion") when he declared: "Civilization has no longer to be discovered nor the new City to be built in the clouds. It has existed and it exists; it is the Christian civilization—the Catholic City. It is only necessary to keep on founding and rebuilding it on its natural and divine foundations." For Catholics, that mandate makes deep demands on the virtues of social justice and social charity. It anathematizes abstention as an aberration. Participation, not protective refuge in a self-imposed intellectual enclave, is the obligation of the hour. It will not be easy. It never was—to build a human community, a society fit for *persons*, creatures the Son of God thought worth His death.

⁶ Henri de Lubac, S.J., *Catholicism: A Study of Dogma in Relation to the Corporate Destiny of Mankind*. Longmans, New York, 1950.

⌘ TRENDS ⌘

Communist Parliamentary Decline

Recent elections in various European countries have greatly reduced Communist positions in electoral bodies.

In elections last October in Norway all 11 Communists who had held seats in the Storting, the national Congress, were rejected at the polls. Municipal elections in Sweden showed a marked decline in Communist popularity; the Communists lost 12 of their 17 seats in the Stockholm city council. Their seats in the Danish parliament were reduced from nine to seven in recent elections.

No Communist was elected to office in the British elections last April. Two seats in Commons were lost and 105 candidates, rejected. Communist representation in the Belgian parliament now stands at 10 seats, less than one-third the number held in 1946.

Most recent state elections held in Germany late in November have removed all Communists from the state parliaments of Hesse and Wuertemberg-Baden for the first time since the close of the war.

For United Europe

During July of this year two small German towns were canvassed for their opinion on the question of a United Europe. The two towns were Breisach, in the southwest of Germany, near the French border, and the Ruhr mining city of Castrop-Rauxel.

In Breisach, on July 9, more than 87 per cent of the voters of town turned out to vote on the question, "Do you favor the abolition of political and economic frontiers in Europe and the unification of all European peoples in a European federal state?" More than 95 per cent of those voting answered affirmatively.

The plebescite was preceded by a two-month campaign sponsored by *Europa Union*, a German movement affiliated with the international Union Européenne des Fédéralistes. The German group was founded by Dr. Eugen Kogon, the brilliant editor of the Catholic *Frankfurter Hefte*, one of the best monthly periodicals in western Germany. Dr. Kogon, who was an inmate of Buchenwald for seven years, 1938-45 spoke in Breisach on the eve of the voting

The plebescite was held in Castrop-Rauxel on July 16. In this fairly large community the Communists carried on a vigorous offensive against the plebescite. Despite their efforts, a heavy vote (73 per cent) was recorded, and 31,806 out of 34,239 votes were in favor of European Union.

The great amount of interest aroused by the test plebescites has led to preparations for even larger tests. Sponsors are planning a vote now for either Frankfurt or Munich, and several cities of western Germany have requested *Europa Union* plebescites for their citizens.

Late in July the executive committee of the movement voted a five-point program of action to spread the idea of political and economic union for all Europe. The program includes the production of educational films on political questions, the purchase of a newspaper, distribution of pamphlets in which specific problems involved in union will be discussed, a grassroots, door-to-door campaign and a traveling educational exhibition on the topic of European Union.

Turkish Government Threatened

The recent action of Bulgaria in demanding, late in November, that Turkey admit 250,000 Bulgars of Turkish descent constitutes a serious threat to the new and almost totally inexperienced Turkish government.

The task of processing and caring for so many refugees in the midst of winter would be difficult for any administration. It will be particularly hard for the present government, which took office late in May after a surprise landslide overthrow of former President Ismet İnönü. Only the leader of the five-year-old Democratic party, President Celal Bayar, has had administrative experience to any degree. The government, moreover, is already under strain because it promised extravagant improvements in all areas of domestic life and has been unable to carry out its projects.

Not only will the flood of refugees from Bulgaria seriously strain government facilities, but it will place a tremendous new burden on the already weak Turkish econ-

omy. Besides, the speed with which the transfers must be admitted will preclude exclusion of Communist agitators.

The likelihood of internal disorders and even of external intervention at some early date is considerable.

Southern Negroes Voting

A recent publication of the Southern Regional Conference, *Safety, Security and the South*, reports that 77 per cent of all Negroes responding to a questionnaire on the subject were registered voters; 23.1 per cent were not registered. Only 13 per cent stated that they had met unfriendly treatment at the polls.

On the other hand 29 per cent indicated that there was some intimidation in their communities to keep Negroes from voting. About 20 per cent reported pressure to direct their vote to a specific candidate.

The authors of the report, Alexander F. Miller, of the Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, and Mozell Hill, Atlanta University, recommend the following lines of action:

1. Intensifying registration drives and voting, since civil rights of Negroes and the right to vote are distinctly associated.
2. Better and more equal police protection, especially by integration of Negroes into police forces.
3. Legislation to eliminate Klan activities.
4. Fostering an informed and responsible citizenry.
5. Community self-analysis to discover lines of further improvement.

Better in the Country?

Uniform Crime Reports, a semiannual bulletin issued by the F.B.I., reports that crime continues to rise at a faster rate in rural areas. While the urban crime rate for the first six months of 1950 increased only 1.9 per cent over what it was for the same period in 1949, rural rates were up 7.4 per cent over the first half of 1949.

	URBAN Rate of increase	RURAL Rate of increase
Jan.-June, 1948	-1.8	3.8
Jan.-June, 1949	2.7	7.6
Jan.-June, 1950	1.9	7.4

Reports for 1950 are based on data from 1,662 cities, having a total population of 59,300,183, with the rural population of 36,080,457 being reported by Sheriffs' Offices, Villages and State Police.

The report says: "In publishing the data sent in by chiefs of police in different cities, the FBI does not vouch for their accuracy. They are given out as current information which may throw some light on problems of crime and criminal-law enforcement."

Cana Helps

In his Foreward to *Cana Conference Proceedings* (Chicago, 1950) Cardinal Stritch says that Cana has been a distinct help to him as pastor of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Six thousand couples have already attended Cana Conferences in the Chicago area, more than fourteen hundred of them in 1949. Pre-Cana has already attracted more than seventeen thousand engaged couples. Pre-Cana was on the air during October, with the Catholic Hour presenting a Pre-Cana Conference over the NBC network. A richer, fuller living of Catholic family life cannot but be the result of all these wonderful efforts.

Population Profile

In an address based upon preliminary census figures, Dr. Louis I. Dublin informed the audience at the *New York Herald Tribune* Forum that while population in the United States has increased at the remarkable rate of 19,000,000 in the past decade, families have multiplied even more rapidly. In 1940 there were 32,000,000 families in the total population of 131,669,000; preliminary figures on the 1950 census indicate that there are about 40,000,000 families in about 151,000,000. Thus, while population was increasing at the rate of less than 15 per cent, families increased by one fourth.

One significant population trend was reversed during the past decade. Over a very long period of years children had continued to be a steadily decreasing part of the population. The 1950 Census shows that there has been a sharp increase both in the number and in the proportion of children in the population. At the present time more than one tenth of the population is under five years of age.

At the same time the number of aged persons in the country has been increasing. In 1900 only four per cent of the population was over 65 years of age; today the proportion would be close to eight per cent.

BOOKS

THE ECONOMIC ROLE OF THE STATE.—By William A. Orton. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1950, 192 pp. \$3.00.

This book originated in a series of lectures. The author, known especially for an earlier work, *The Liberal Tradition*, is professor of economics at Smith College. He is trying here to interpret the relation of the state to the economic order in terms of a genuine liberalism, stripped of the individualism which he thinks was always alien.

The criteria of state action and policy are primarily moral rather than economic. For there is an objective moral order; the state is part of that order and bounded by it; and no extension of its power and activity beyond the limits set by that order can be justified by claiming that the process of extension is formally democratic. Democracy itself is a proposition in morality. All this involves a definite concept of human nature, as Professor Orton insists. It implies the ability of men to recognize and agree on certain fundamental moral principles. It is a clear affirmation of natural law.

The difficulty in defining the proper limits to state activity arises today from a wide-spread sense of insecurity and helplessness. When man finds himself virtually unable to control his economic future by his own efforts, he is confronted with a momentous choice. Since the more desirable condition is "free personality in a free society"—a value judgment which is taken to be evident—he may fight to restore freedom, with a correlative willingness to assume the major part of the responsibility for his own and his family's welfare. The easier way is, however, to transfer to the state the demands he formerly made on himself, to regard his rights not as the bulwarks of a free citizen against the state but as claims of the dependent on the state.

The evil consequence of such an attitude is that, by accepting and even encouraging such a philosophy "almost any type of government may gain and maintain itself in power." This happened in Germany.

Would it seem partisan to question whether it is happening here at home?

A serious question arises concerning the fundamental value judgments which are the principles of any social philosophy. They are said (pp. 44-46) to be acts of the will, not merely of the intellect; to represent a choice from among various alternatives, a choice which is not arbitrary but depends on "a certain disposition, or predisposition of the mind, acting within a given set of circumstances . . ." The entire passage is either very poorly and ambiguously expressed or is in conflict with what Professor Orton has elsewhere said.

With this one exception, *The Economic Role of The State* may be highly recommended as a well conceived and well written study of a problem that concerns us all.

PAUL V. KENNEDY, S.J.
West Baden College
West Baden, Indiana

TAXES AND ECONOMIC INCENTIVES.—By Lewis H. Kimmel. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C., 1950, x, 217 pp. \$2.50.

Governmental commitments are now so great that the taxes which are necessary to honor them can be forthcoming only if our economy continues to flourish and expand. This admitted fact raises the problem with which this study concerns itself, namely, the effect which our present taxes have upon the incentives that are necessary to an expanding and free economy. It is concerned, therefore, with the taxpayers' reactions and their repercussions in the economic sphere.

In the words of the author, "In this situation a tax policy that will promote economic expansion and high-level national income is imperative. A basic requirement is a tax system that will not unduly impair economic incentives. The heart of the tax problem is how to reduce the restrictive effects of taxation to the minimum compatible with raising the necessary revenues. Though at first glance this might seem a

truism, in formulating tax policies the conservation of incentives has frequently been overlooked or subordinated to other objectives deemed more important.

In pursuance of this aim, the author analyzes the principal kinds of taxes and their incidence, corporate income taxes, personal income taxes, sales and excise taxes, property taxes and pay-roll taxes. By means of answers to questionnaires, as well as other data, the author then attempts to assay the extent to which the various kinds of taxes interfere with economic expansion and repress incentives.

The final chapter contains a summary of the author's conclusions and some suggestions for improving the tax system. His studies lead him to conclude, among other things, that the income tax problem is the primary one.

There are many tables of statistics interspersed throughout the text and a statistical appendix.

CORNELIUS A. ELLER, S.J.
ISS
St. Louis University

MANAGEMENT IN MOTION: The Corporate Decision Making Process As Applied to the Transfer of Employees.—By Neil W. Chamberlain. Labor and Management Center, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, 1950, ii, 124 pp. \$2.00.

This booklet is written primarily for personnel and executive officials of all ranks in any large company. It could be read most profitably by any labor-relations educator.

The specific case history of the Southern New England Telephone Company unrolls the company's progressive policy in relation to its inter- and intra-departmental personnel changes among its 9,000 employees.

The analytical light of Mr. Chamberlain's methodic mind reveals the *problem* in the first historical cross-section, from 1935 to 1941. The problem is: How are transfers made? Why are they made?

The second cross-section discusses the formation of *Bulletin No. 8*, actuated on February 14, 1945.

The objective was to establish the transfer procedure in such a co-ordinated manner that the maximum benefit of the employee's abilities would be realized for himself and utilized for the company.

The last section of this work shows the obstacles in trying to put this plan into

effect. The main obstacle lay in the fact that the various shop foremen who executed it had not helped to formulate the procedure, hence, they misunderstood or misapplied it.

Dealing with a human problem, written in a human way by a very human mind, this booklet is interesting and stimulating.

T. BRYON COLLINS, S.J.
Weston College

ECONOMICS OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.—By Gordon F. Bloom and Herbert R. Northrup. The Blakiston Company, Philadelphia and Toronto, 1950, x, 749 pp. \$5.00.

Coming as one among a small string of recently published texts in this field (Shister, Reynolds, Phelps, the revision of Yoder), this new work brings its own special virtues to commend it. Chief among the good qualities is a top-notch block of thirteen chapters, comprising Part IV, embodying the most thorough corpus of economic theory of labor yet to meet this reviewer's eye. The analysis is scholarly and thorough; conflicting viewpoints are noted; there is a good synthesis of the best of the old and the new research findings. Documentation reveals knowledge and judicious use of a wide range of sound sources, and the text shows thoughtful and competent applications to current circumstances.

The theoretical treatment mentioned above makes up almost half of the book. It is a complete little treatise on theory admirably suited for a semester of advanced work. It would be a difficult section for the ordinary undergraduate.

The remaining five parts consist of a short introductory chapter, labor history and statistics, unions and collective bargaining, minimum labor standards and social security, labor relations and public policy. The latter section is of unusual quality: the occasions calling for appraisal of trends and policies are honestly confronted. Comment is sane, competent and discerning; it manifests a rare combination of scholarly objectivity and feet-on-the-ground sophistication. The section on legislation and the concluding chapter on future policy are especially good examples.

Bloom is a practicing Massachusetts attorney with previous research to his credit with the Labor Department, OPA and the Social Science Research Council. Northrup has been teaching at Columbia

SOCIAL ORDER

University and New York University, and is now with the National Industrial Conference Board. His major work, in addition to several well-known monographs, is the book *Organized Labor and the Negro*. This joint product is a valuable addition to the textbook literature. But it will require a good teacher and a soundly-grounded student group to get the full fruit from it.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
ISS
St. Louis University

MEAT AND MAN: A Study of Monopoly, Unionism, and Food Policy. — By Lewis Corey. The Viking Press, New York, 1950, x, 377 pp. \$4.50.

This book was born of a suggestion made to the author some five years ago by the international secretary-treasurer of the AFL union in the meat-packing industry. The author has tried to write the story of the industry "in all its interrelated aspects: economics, management, and unionism within the larger framework of their social performance, significance and problems." (p. ix). He has succeeded as well as the limits of a single popular volume ever allow.

There are chapters on the size and scope of the industry, historical background of meat-packing, the American background, monopolistic elements, labor history and conditions of work, governmental investigations and attempted controls. Chapters follow on farmers and stockmen and their organizations, sales and distribution.

Here the author reaches the question of present day 'monopoly' in the industry. It is in this chapter on "The Packing Industry Today: Monopoly, Competition, and Policy," that he makes a proposal that will intrigue especially the students of the "industry council" idea of Catholic social teaching. The author calls for a Public Meat Authority, appointed by the president from a panel nominated by managements, labor unions, farmer and consumer organizations, cooperatives, and retailers. This Authority is to direct the public corporations formed through the nationalized Big Four leading companies of the present industry. The "independent packers" presently functioning would continue in private hands, and the public corporations should provide a TVA-type yardstick for prices and services in the industry.

Further chapters touch on packing-house labor and its human and technological

aspects, unionism in the industry, relations between union and union and between unions and managements. The concluding pages discuss world food policy, research into nutrition, distribution and such related questions.

The author has turned out a book worthy of the time and attention of economists and political scientists especially. It is a well-knit assemblage of information on the industry and its social angles. His concrete proposal for the Public Meat Authority merits careful and prudent appraisal.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
ISS
St. Louis University

PATTERNS OF PROGRESS — By Horace M. Kallen. Columbia University Press, New York, 1950, xii, 87 pp. \$1.75.

This is a collection of three essays embodying the substance of the author's Matchette Foundation Lectures delivered at Columbia in 1949. The author is Professor of Philosophy and Psychology at the New School for Social Research, and is the author of many works. He is described on the jacket as "considered by many the best interpreter of the pragmatic philosophy of William James" and "one of the original and foremost expounders of the concept of cultural pluralism in America."

The three essays are entitled: "The Will to Progress," "Cultural Lag," and "Of Death and the Future." The new concept of progress is that the means are primary; the ends, secondary. "Going, not goal, is primary. Take care of the means and the ends will take care of themselves." Progress is a religion. Immortality consists in the will to progress which presses on without security save only that the Promethean fire it carries will be handed on, "Progress whose wisdom is science and work civilization."

As can be seen, these lectures are serious; not academic treatises. Professor Kallen's academic stature is not heightened by speaking of the traditional view that the ends justify the means and illustrating this doctrine by Busenbaum's words, "when the end is lawful, the means are also lawful." Does not Kallen know that "justify" in this context means to make what is in itself bad, good?

Adoption of such views would divorce progress from morality. And in these days of world aggression and conflict we should need no philosophical demonstration to

show that morality must always be the measure of progress.

RICHARD L. PORTER, S.J.
University of San Francisco.

MARRIAGE ANALYSIS: Foundations For Successful Family Life.—By Harold T. Christensen. The Ronald Press Co., New York, 1950, viii, 510 pp. \$4.50.

Dr. Christensen is genuinely concerned with the fact that modern marriages fall significantly short of the happiness and personal satisfaction possible and desirable.

Marriage and family breakdowns call for a new understanding of the interpersonal relationships of men and women planning or experiencing married life. This is the viewpoint adopted throughout the book. Its purpose is the improvement of marriage by analyzing the conditions under which it exists, the elements composing it, and the dynamics of the developmental stages.

Part I ("Dimensions") proposes the problem and the aim: greater happiness from "intelligent and cooperative living."

Part II ("Factors," five chapters) interprets and analyses the components or structural aspects of family life: society and contemporary culture, personalities of each, relationships of the sexes and the role of sex in marriage. It concludes with some speculation on the possibility of predicting scientifically future success or failure.

Part III ("Processes," seven chapters) takes the reader through the developmental stages of family life. These are the love interests of courtship and engagement, successful choice of a mate, the experiences immediately preceding and following the wedding, mature mate adjustment for pair unity in marriage, becoming parents and fulfilling the responsibility, the problems of aging couples and of loss of partner by death.

Part IV ("Programs"), the final chapter, lists the various contributions that research, education, counseling, religion and the community can give to family solidarity.

No one can question the sincerity of the author. He regularly adopts a conservative and generally commendable position. Experience and careful study make his pages replete with helpful facts, sound interpretations and provocative insights. The brief section on "A Philosophy of

Discipline" is excellent and is an example of his good judgment in practical matters of family life.

For Catholics, sections of the book raise the interesting problem of the extent to which they can admit the democratization of marriage and the establishment of male-female relationships on an equalitarian basis.

We cannot assent to his assumptions on birth control. His stand is generally one of opposition to divorce and extra marital sex activity; but it is not absolute, nor in terms of morality.

Unless, in the interests of being "scientific," he has deliberately kept silent, he seems to have no understanding of the divine institution and regulation of marriage and the family. Consequently, his interpretations of "the core problems of marriage" is inadequate. If it is too unscientific to relate the factors and processes of marriage to God and His purposes, then the improvement sought will not be realized.

GEORGE J. McKEON, S.J.
Weston College
Weston, Mass.

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS.—Edited by Alphonse H. Clemens, Ph.D. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., 1950, vi, 131 pp. \$2.25.

This publication presents selected papers from the first two workshops on marriage and family relationships held at the Catholic University of America in June of 1948 and 1949. Catholic literature in this field is still not too plentiful so that Dr. Clemens has rendered a real service in editing these lectures.

It is rather difficult to give a just appraisal of this collection without treating each lecture separately. Obviously, such an approach is hardly feasible in a brief review. Besides the rather basic lectures on the crisis in family life, the philosophy of marriage and the family, the liturgy in the family, the canon and civil law of the family, there are several stimulating lectures on education for Catholic family life. Perhaps the most interesting, and most controversial, are the two lectures of Fr. Sattler entitled: "Educating Parents to Sex Instruction," and "Principles and Facts for Sex Instruction." Educators of all ranks will profit by a thoughtful reading of his treatment here. Finally, I cannot refrain from mentioning the very sug-

gestive paper on family recreation by Daniel Culhane. It is hoped that the publication of these papers will stimulate further thought and research on the problems of Catholic family life.

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.
ISS
St Louis University

MANPOWER ECONOMICS AND LABOR PROBLEMS.—By Dale Yoder. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1950, xii, 661 pp. \$5.00.

Despite its new title, this work is the third edition of the author's *Labor Economics and Labor Problems*, bringing up to date the 1939 edition. But it does much more than that, because the book has been almost completely rewritten. From the standpoint of manpower as a natural re-

source of society, the author has analysed anew the development, utilization, and conservation of manpower.

The book is well organized for teaching purposes and might serve for either the one or two-semester course. From the initial chapters on orientation, definitions and descriptions of labor force, the work moves into the economic theory of labor in general, then into unionism and its effects on theoretical positions. Concluding chapters discuss "problems" and union, business, and public policies.

The work is a great improvement over the earlier edition, and the material has been brought up to date. Yoder has made a real contribution. His book will be useful and widely used.

MORTIMER H. GAVIN, S.J.
ISS
St. Louis University

LETTERS

Social Order for Schools

Perhaps you have thought of sending notices about the release of **SOCIAL ORDER** to all Catholic colleges and high schools. If not, the directory is available through the department of education, National Catholic Welfare Conference. I do wish I could simply say: "Send each of them a subscription at my expense."

(Rev.) JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.
West Baden Springs, Ind.

Commends SOCIAL ORDER

I am very happy to learn that **SOCIAL ORDER** will be made available to the public beginning January 1st. As one of those "outsiders" privileged to have been on your mailing list since the magazine was first established three or four years ago for private circulation among your own men, I feel that I am in a position to give a rather objective appraisal of your work. In my opinion you and your colleagues have done a remarkably good job in every respect. **SOCIAL ORDER**, as the only American monthly devoted exclusively to Catholic social teaching, fills a real need and fills it very well. I feel confident that thousands of priests, sisters, seminarians, and laymen will welcome the opportunity to subscribe. You may be sure that I

will do everything I possibly can to help you develop the circulation which the magazine so richly deserves. I have already called attention to it two or three times in our own little monthly bulletin, *Social Action Notes for Priests*, and from time to time in the future I will again make reference to it for the benefit of our subscribers.

(Rev.) GEORGE G. HIGGINS
N.C.W.C.
Washington, D. C.

Study Price Controls

Some months ago, in an article in the May, 1950, issue of *The Sign*, the Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, now archbishop of Cincinnati, pointed out some problems to be solved in the question of vocational order. He said in part: "Some Catholic social scientists hold that the function [of Industry Councils] must include the determination not only of the process of production and distribution, but also decisions concerning profits, wages, hours and the expansion and location of industry. Others vehemently reject this definition of function, especially in respect to profits, prices and capital investment."

I would like to propose to interested readers of **SOCIAL ORDER** a discussion of one question indicated above by Arch-

bishop Alter. SOCIAL ORDER readers are probably as divided on the question of price regulation as those he speaks of. One wrote recently that *Quadragesimo Anno* commits us to it; another asserts that market regulation is precisely what *Q.A.* does not intend to do and that there is no question of setting prices and wages. Still others are seeking a mid-way position.

How tenable each of these positions is, I do not know. Whether their proponents have thought out the problems, I do not know. But an extended discussion of the question of prices would, I think, be valuable.

Let me propose a few questions I would like to see clarified by both sides.

Take, first, the "free competition" position—not, of course, the kind condemned by *Q.A.* Assuming that it is based on automatic results in 1. stabilizing full use of resources and full employment, and 2. optimum allocation of resources, may I ask whether advocates of this position have noted the following adverse criticisms by two eminent price theorists, John M. Clark and Corwin Edwards: 1. the market economy has its own bias, end and tendencies; 2. price flexibility alone cannot assure full employment; 3. optimum allocation of resources is an exaggerated claim; 4. competition is only one element of our mixed economy; 5. competition cannot be universal (and Mr. Edwards is a U. S. anti-trust counsel!).

How, then will proponents of a free-market economy meet these objections of Clark and Edwards? If, on the other hand, their market pricing operates within some framework of control, what is the economics of this control framework?

As for price regulation, I don't recall having seen an exposition of the economics of this position. I sometimes wonder whether advocates of control have weighed the social and economic costs involved. At any rate, let me propose some questions which price-control raises in my mind. My questions fall into three groups: 1. function, 2. implicit economics, 3. place left for competition.

Function: Will regulated prices aid resource allocation? Will it not perpetuate rigidity, close off opportunity for the dynamic leaders we always need? Is price regulation to maintain full employment? Clark and Edwards say this is asking too much of any pricing mechanism.

Implicit economics: Can they separate quota-regulation from price-regulation?

Will not technological development or even capital development be curbed? Maintaining high prices will protect high-cost (therefore, presumably undesirable) producers. How do they avoid this?

Let's look at the direction of prices. Is it stable? downward? upward? These are not idle questions. Take the last one. How will they avoid a log-rolling inflation? Can we presume that individual groups will not vote themselves increased prices? If workers within a group demand increased wages, will managers yield and pass the increase on to the consumers? Is it not naive to think, in the light of, e.g., Interstate Commerce Commission experience, that public representatives can make out a cogent case against the move? Did not Steel, despite public resentment and government opposition, raise its price?

If many groups of workers make demands, how can government keep up with all cases to be studied or do an effective job on them? What prevents deals between workers and owners or among owners which workers approve because they profit? How do you prevent subsidization of thousands of workers in moribund industries instead of their transfer to growing businesses?

Place left for competition: How, concretely, does price regulation protect the social values of competition? How does it assure real alternatives to users and consumers? How is flexibility of prices preserved? How does this group assess the experience of N. R. A., British business, continental cartels?

The brevity and selectivity of these questions lays me open to the charge of not comprehending the respective positions or of ignoring the pertinent literature of exposition. Nevertheless, I believe these questions are fairly representative of the kind being asked by reasonably well informed people.

Can we clarify the issues by some thoughtful discussion?

(REV.) PHILIP S. LAND, S.J.
Institute of Social Order
St. Louis

Acknowledgements—p. 10: John F. Cronin, *Catholic Social Principles*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1950, pp. 216-17; p. 6: Henri de Lubac, "The New Man: the Marxist and the Christian View," *Cross Currents*, 1 (Fall, 1950) 86; p. 28: A. D. Lindsay, *The Modern Democratic State*, Oxford, 1947, 1, 187.

Worth Reading

Kurt Schuschnigg, "Judicial Administration and National Defense," *Journal of the American Judicature Society*, 34 (October, 1950) 70-75.

Professor Schuschnigg, in an address before the annual meeting of the American Judicature Society, September 20, 1950, examines the critical position of the judiciary in the breakdown of socio-legal order. "Once the courts cease to function fairly and impartially, nothing can stop general demoralization."

Benjamin L. Masse, "Pope Pius XII on Capitalism," *America*, 84 (December 2, 1950) 277-79.

Father Masse discusses several recent papal statements on capitalism and their application to the American economy. He finds the exaggerated capitalism implicit in doctrines of economic liberalism condemned and that "it is impossible [today] to characterize our system of private enterprise as economic liberalism."

Barbara Ward, "Faith for Freedom," *Atlantic Monthly*, 186 (December, 1950) 25-29.

The celebrated collaborator of the London *Economist* publishes the final chapter of her forthcoming book, *Policy for the West*. In it she emphasizes that Western policy seems "to have lost sight of its own vision of the good society" which is implicit in its Greek and Judaeo-Christian heritage.

Henri de Lubac, "The New Man: the Marxist and the Christian View," *Cross Currents*, 1 (Fall, 1950) 67-88.

Father de Lubac, in an essay originally read at the *Semaine Sociale* of France in 1947, examines Marxist humanism and evaluates it in the light of Christianity.

"Southern Collegians Resist Racism," *Catholic World*, 172 (December, 1950) 180-85.

A group of white college students, members of the Southeastern Regional Interracial Commission of the National Federation of Catholic College Students, discuss the early integration of Negroes in Southern Catholic colleges.

Josef Pieper, "The Social Meaning of Leisure in the Modern World," *Review of Politics*, 12 (October, 1950) 411-21.

To the classic idea of the proletarian, namely, propertylessness and dependence upon wage work for livelihood, Dr. Pieper adds the trait of a psychological fettering to work so that it appears to be the primary, indeed the sole, activity worthy of man. Against this condition he stresses the necessity of a liberalizing use of leisure as a necessary step in deproletarianization. The defect of this suggestion is that it seems, at least, to despair of work as an integrally humane act.

Clair Wilcox, "Concentration of Power in the American Economy," *Harvard Business Review*, 28 (November, 1950) 54-60.

Professor Wilcox discounts the effectiveness of big business in controlling markets (largely because economic power is concentrated in only a few areas of manufacturing) and, while acknowledging the existence of some investment control, emphasizes the rival power of "big" labor, agriculture and little business.

The November, 1950, issue of the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, is devoted to the topic, "Toward Family Stability." Seven articles study various factors contributing to stability or instability. Eight examine forces and institutions fostering stability (religion receives minimal treatment). Educational preparation for family life at the higher and secondary levels, through agencies for "social hygiene" and church programs are considered. A final section of three articles examines the family in other countries.

During 1951

SOCIAL ORDER

will discuss many of the social problems that confront us in the United States today. There will be a half-dozen articles on industrial order, several others on other aspects of industrial relations, a half-dozen on the problems of minorities in American society, others on the family, rural and agricultural questions, future population.

A full issue will be devoted to the socio-economic thought of the great German scholar, Heinrich Pesch, on the 25th anniversary of his death.

There will be extended reviews of significant books by John U. Nef, Wilhelm Roepke, Henri de Lubac, Crane Brinton, John F. Cronin and others.

In order not to miss a single issue of "the only American monthly devoted exclusively to Catholic social teaching," fill out and mail the subscription blank to us today.

Please send SOCIAL ORDER for years at \$4.00 a year, beginning with the issue for the month of
to:

Name

Address

City Zone State

☐ Remittance enclosed

☐ Bill me

SOCIAL ORDER
3115 S. GRAND BLVD.
ST. LOUIS 18, MO.

